

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XLIII, No. 24
WHOLE No. 1095

September 20, 1930

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

| | PAGES |
|---|----------|
| CHRONICLE | 555-558 |
| EDITORIALS | |
| Selling Marriage Annulments—The Diamond Market—Lynching Ebbs and Flows—Using Boys to Advantage—A Curb on Greed—More Trouble in the South | 559-561 |
| TOPICS OF INTEREST | |
| Cant and Catholic Education—Fun for the Workingman—What Do the Colored Catholics Want?—Has Science Disproved Religion?—More Words to My Next Nurse... | 562-569 |
| POETRY | |
| The Brothers—Speculation—If I had Known | 564; 574 |
| EDUCATION | |
| Do Catholics Oppose the Public Schools?... | 570-571 |
| SOCIOLOGY | |
| Home Ties | 571-572 |
| WITH SCRIP AND STAFF | 572-574 |
| LITERATURE | |
| The Critics of Humanism | 574-576 |
| REVIEWS | 576-578 |
| COMMUNICATIONS | 578 |

Chronicle

Home News.—At the suggestion of President Hoover, the State Department, on September 9, announced its intention of limiting immigration as a relief measure for unemployment. According to an official calculation approximately 150,000 immigrants entered the United States last year from countries included in the quota, and about 60,000 from non-quota countries. The only provision of the present law that can materially alter these figures is a section that withholds visas from persons likely to become "public charges." The various foreign consuls will be urged to apply this clause very strictly. Immigration from Mexico was reduced 88.9 per cent during the past six months, and it was said that Canadian immigration, when figures become available, would show a very large reduction. The action of the President and the State Department was the result of an agitation on the part of the American Federation of Labor and other labor groups to stop all immigration this fall and winter. The proposal was approved by Secretary of Labor Davis, and by him submitted to the State Department. The plan appealed to Mr. Hoover, who sought to have the present law amended by the last Congress so as to cut quotas in half as an emergency measure to reduce unemployment, but the request was entered too late.

The results of the primary elections of the past week marked a trend against Prohibition. This was particularly the case in Michigan, where four wet candidates for the House of Representatives were victorious. Amongst those defeated were Representative Grant M. Hudson, and Representative Louis C. Cramton, both prominent members of the Anti-Saloon League. The renomination of Senator Couzens, by a large majority, was also regarded as a wet victory. In South Carolina Senator Blease lost a closely contested struggle to former Representative Byrnes, pro-Smith man. New Hampshire Democrats chose Albert W. Noone, a wet, as their candidate for both the Senate and the Governorship. In Washington Ralph A. Horr, wet Republican, took the nomination for Congress from Representative John F. Miller, a dry. Washington Republicans some time ago adopted a wet plank, and Senator Jones, author of the "five and ten" law, while predicting that voters would not permit any notable change on the Prohibition question, promised to approve the submission of a resolution amending the Constitution, should his State go wet.

Some slight signs of recovery from the general business depression were remarked last week when it became known that steel-ingot production in August increased 161,894 tons over that of July. The *Business Improves Slightly* *Iron Age* reported the steel industry, as a whole, to be operating at 55 per cent of capacity last week as compared with 54 per cent the previous week, and 52 per cent the week before. Carloadings from August 17 to 23 showed a total of 940,549, an advance of 17,736 over the preceding week, but 197,000 under the figures for the same time last year. Bank clearings were larger during the last days of August than previously but 33.9 less than in the corresponding period of 1929. In spite of increased optimism over business conditions reports from various parts of the country were not overassuring. In New England, where the general business situation had not materially changed in the past few months, a greater demand for wool was reported; the leather market also showed some improvement, and shoe manufacturers were preparing to enlarge their activities. Philadelphia announced larger orders for textile goods, furniture, and radios. In the West, Kansas City reported an increase in business, and an advance of \$7,000,000 in gold reserves and of \$6,000,000 in accounts of banks belonging to Federal Reserve Bank for the Tenth District. According to an estimate of the Treasury Department, there was \$8,253,541,522 in circulation in the United States on August 31.

Argentina.—Twenty-four hours after President Hipólito Irigoyen had delegated the executive power temporarily to Vice-President Enrique V. Martínez, the opposition, which had been gathering strength against him, gained complete control. The revolutionary forces were led by General José Uriburu with the support of the Argentine Navy, commanded by Admiral Alberto Storni. The first step of General Uriburu was to establish a provisional Government, composed of civilians and military leaders. The revolution, though swift and brief, was not accomplished without bloodshed. Ten persons were killed and about seventy wounded. Two army Colonels were shot to death when they refused to join in the revolt. The building of *La Epoca*, the organ of Irigoyen's Radical Party, was destroyed by fire. While martial law restored order in the capital, army men were appointed to replace the civil Governors of the fourteen States. Orders were given for the removal of the former President to the battleship *Belgrano*, anchored off La Plata. The cruiser was due to sail on September 11 for Montevideo. In order to meet the critical financial and political problems facing the disturbed nation the revolutionary Government floated a short-term loan with every one of the twenty-seven banks in Buenos Ayres participating. The subscription was negotiated by the Banco Provincia and amounted to 50,000,000 paper pesos (\$24,450,000).

British and American bankers joined with Argentine financiers in offering to lend the new Government about 100,000,000 pesos (\$36,810,000) in the form of a short term loan to tide it over any urgent financial needs. The American banks participating were the National City Bank of New York and the First National Bank of Boston. Each of these offered 5,000,000 pesos. Since the peso was worth 36.81 cents at current exchange rates as against 44.44 cents at par, the offer of the American banks represented about \$3,600,000. Due to the rigid censorship no information was available respecting the origin of street riots which marked the night of September 8.

China.—Nanking military dispatches stated that forty divisions, comprising 400,000 men, were advancing toward Chengchow over the railroads east and south of the insurgent base city. Independent advices reported thousands of Nanking soldiers were moving westward over the Haichow-Tungkwan Railroad from Suchow, Kiangsu Province, having been withdrawn from Shantung battlefields. They were hampered in their advance westward of Kweichow, in Honan, by floods which crippled the railroad. Nanking troops in Eastern Honan indulged in much lawlessness, forcing peasants to evacuate their homes and live in the open. Farmers were pressed into military service and women compelled to prepare meals. Numerous work animals, carts and mats were seized by the soldiers. Banditry likewise took heavy toll throughout the Honan Province, while troops have occupied considerable mission

property along the Haichow-Tungkwan Railway. According to a dispatch from Rome there were powerful elements in the Nationalist Government in China aiming to unseat Christianity. It was said that the educational restrictions proposed by the Government would ruin thousands of mission schools throughout the country.

Dominican Republic.—A tropical hurricane struck Santo Domingo, capital of the Republic at 2 p. m., September 4, and blew for four hours, killing more than 4,000, seriously injuring 5,000 and causing a property loss estimated at from \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000. The horror grew as refugees continued to drift in from outlying towns, bringing new tales of destruction and death. The city was left without light, power or water, while food and housing were likewise pressing problems. Among the public buildings totally or partly destroyed were the Presidential Palace, the edifice housing the Cabinet Secretaries near the fortress, the Chamber of Deputies, the Court of Appeals, the Fire Department headquarters and the buildings of the French and American Legations. Of the city's 10,000 buildings all but 400 were destroyed. As a result 30,000 persons, at a minimum, were homeless and in urgent need. The colonial churches, among the sturdiest buildings, became the haven of thousands. The famous cathedral, 400 years old, with the tomb of Christopher Columbus escaped destruction. The large towns of La Vega, Santiago and Puerto Plata were not damaged.

The National Congress, acting in an emergency capacity, granted President Trujillo full administrative powers. His first act was to order the streets and other danger spots thoroughly cleaned immediately to forestall an epidemic (which was imminent) due to lack of sanitation.

Anti-typhoid serum was rushed by plane from Porto Rico. Besides the Roosevelt Emergency Hospital, more than fifty tents were set up as hospitals, being equipped with surgical instruments and medical supplies likewise brought from Porto Rico. In response to the appeal of President Trujillo the American Red Cross and the Navy and Marine Corps concerted emergency relief measures. As a result 9,000 persons were inoculated against disease, 20,000 were being fed regularly by the Government and the water supply had been repaired. Despite the havoc wrought by the hurricane, President Trujillo insisted the international debt obligations of the republic would "be fulfilled with strict punctuality."

France.—The most elaborate French army maneuvers since the War were concluded September 10 on the Franco-German frontier with a grand review of 50,000 picked troops and 300 airplanes. André Maginot, Minister of War, went to Luneville, in Lorraine, to be present at the final stages of the mimic warfare. With him were Marshal Pétain, Generals Weygand, De Beney and Helle and the military attachés of many foreign nations. Despite heavy rains the troops showed good endurance, and great progress was noted in both defense and attack op-

Revolt
Succeeds

Hurricane
Damage

Loan
Negotiations

Relief
Measures

Troops
Advance

Army
Manoeuvres

erations. Field and heavy artillery and anti-aircraft guns played an almost constant role, while the work of the air service was conspicuous. During the progress of the maneuvers, which began September 4, certain organs of German opinion bitterly criticized the French high command for conducting such realistic "warfare" on the borders of a friendly Power.

Germany.—The only cheerful report on the critical condition of German industry came from the Prussian Trade Ministry, which considered that the rapid depletion of stocks of manufactured goods, lately sold off at reduced prices, was creating a basis for renewal of manufacturing activity. But the general condition of the heavy industries and those producing raw materials showed little improvement. The Stahlwerksverband reported unfavorably on all branches of the steel trade. Since the international steel cartel a few weeks ago abolished export price fixing for semi-products and joists, the market had been entirely free. It was considered almost certain that the German ingot steel syndicate would be compelled to reduce home prices, which were still about 60 per cent higher than prices on the world market. The Government was reported to be putting price reductions in the forefront of its anti-unemployment campaign; working on the theory that general reduction of prices would automatically and inevitably revive the selling market. Under the cartels ordinance of July 26, the Government issued a decree freeing retailers from various price-maintaining agreements hitherto enforced by the producing cartels.

Hungary.—The former Empress Zita, as head of the Hapsburg family, refused to countenance the recent marriage at the Registry Office in Brighton, England, of Archduke Albrecht and the divorcée Mrs. Irene von Rudnay. This disappointed Albrecht who had dashed to Spain by airplane last week, hoping to obtain not only Zita's approval of the marriage but her promise to support King Alfonso on the Archduke's application to the Vatican for annulment of his wife's first marriage. Albrecht and Madame von Rudnay declared that they would continue to live apart until the marriage was regularized. Hungarian newspapers lost no time in pointing out that Zita's refusal implied no reflection upon Hungarian law, since Albrecht himself promised to recognize the Hapsburg family law when he swore fealty to Archduke Otto some months ago.

India.—Definite rejection by the Mahatma Gandhi and his associates of proposals for peace in India through cessation of the civil-disobedience campaign dashed the hopes of the Moderate envoys who had been in conference with the Nationalist leader for several weeks. At the same time it was announced in London that no invitations had been sent to Mahatma Gandhi, the Pandits Nehru, the Patel brothers, or Mrs. Naidu to attend the round table conference at St. James Palace opening October 20.

Disorders continued among the agriculturists of Islampur, in the Satara district of the Bombay Province. In response to a call for help from the Islampur police, a force of 125 armed police, with Indian officers, started for the scene in motor lorries. The Islampur residents left their homes, joining fugitives from Kholapur, who were in the hills on the borders of Kholapur State. They were reported to be heavily armed. At the village of Daulahat in Bengal a mob attacked the police. Several were injured in the exchange of shots. The censorship still made hard to obtain accurate and definite news of the situation.

Peru.—After vigorous action on the part of United States diplomatic officers at Lima, the Peruvian military junta gave orders for the release of Lieut. Commander Harold D. Grow as well as that of another United States citizen, Charles Sutton, veteran irrigation engineer, who had spent a quarter of a century in Peru. The Department of State at Washington, however, was informed that both Mr. Sutton and Mr. Grow are still liable to legal proceedings "for the acts with which they might be charged." The military junta which took over the Peruvian Government after the recent revolution continued to make changes in the country's foreign service. The resignation of Celso Pastor, Minister to Berlin, was accepted, while the Foreign Office canceled the appointments of Manuel Bonnemaïson, Minister to Japan, and Santiago Bedoya, First Secretary of the Embassy at Vatican City. Wide circulation was given to the statement of Lieut. Col. Sanchez Cerro, head of the junta, who foretold friendly relations with the United States "provided that the United States give Peru the treatment deserved by all free and independent nations, and provided that Peru is treated as an equal."

Poland.—At three o'clock on the morning of September 10 fifteen former Deputies, leaders of the Opposition to Marshal Pilsudski in the Sejm, were arrested, nine in Warsaw and six in provincial cities, without any reason being given, by order of Minister of the Interior Syladowski. Among those arrested were the president of the central executive committee of the Socialist party, M. Barlicki, who was a member of the Government in 1919 and 1925; the noted leader of the Peasant party, M. Witos, thrice Premier, in 1920 during the Bolshevik invasion, in 1923 and in 1926, when Marshal Pilsudski engineered his coup; M. Kiernik, Peasant leader and twice a Cabinet Minister, in 1923 and 1926, and M. Lieberman, Socialist lawyer, pre-war member of the Vienna Parliament, post-war member of the Sejm, and recently public prosecutor in the highest tribunal in the case of Mr. Czechowicz, former Finance Minister. Among others arrested were the organizers of the Summer Opposition Congress in Cracow, at which resolutions were adopted attacking Marshal Pilsudski. It was believed that the arrests would paralyze the Opposition's election campaign before the elections set for November 16.

Industrial
Conditions

U. S. Citizens
Released

Ex-Empress
Makes
Decision

Sudden
Arrests

Peace Hopes
Dimmed

Russia.—According to reports published in the newspaper *Izvestia* only seventy-two per cent of the August grain-collection program was fulfilled. This was consid-

Grain
Food
Taxes

erably below the mark set for the quick collection of grain in order to export some of it while the market was good.

Observers who toured a region in which there were many small collectives and State farms declared that lack of machinery for thrashing grain was the principal reason for slow collections. Coincident with the grain shortage food queues in Moscow grew to such an extent that "Brigades" were formed by the Moscow Regional Trade Department, members of the Moscow Soviet, and active workers, to investigate the evil and find a solution. At the same time the Council of the People's Commissars and the Soviet Central Executive Committee announced a tax reform to be effective October 1. The most interesting feature for foreigners was a clause providing that they should not be charged for exit visas or living permits. The decree also abolished the State taxes on tobacco, cigarettes, tea and marriage and divorce registration fees.

League of Nations.—On Sept. 8, the European nations met to discuss M. Briand's plan for a Pan-European Federation. Before the representatives of the various nations assembled in the Council Room of

Pan-European
Union

the League, M. Briand read his report on the replies he had received to his memorandum of last May. It was a masterly piece of diplomatic writing. Everything that was favorable was brought out while replies that might have been considered unfavorable were cleverly interpreted so as to banish any idea of sharp divergence of opinion. After the report was read, the first point debated was whether the discussion itself should be public. M. Briand wanted public discussion. Mr. Henderson of England wanted the discussions secret because he felt that things would be said which would not sound well in print. M. Briand finally yielded to him. The real debate started, however, when the question of the relation of the Federation to the League of Nations was brought up. M. Briand stood for the idea that the assembled delegates should consider themselves a constituted body. Again his idea was opposed by Mr. Henderson, who held that a body representative of the proposed Federation should come into being as an offshoot of the League of Nations. At the end of his report M. Briand had said: "From these replies, there seems to emerge as a conception shared by a great number of Governments that there should be a single conference, including all the States, which would meet periodically and having from the commencement a committee, bureau or secretariate which could continue in the intervals between meetings the necessary work of organization." Mr. Henderson objected to this conclusion as well as to M. Briand's proposal that if the League was to debate the whole question, there should be some preliminary accord, and some plan or project laid down for it to discuss. According to Mr. Henderson, these proposals of M. Briand's considered the Federation as an accomplished fact. He

could not admit any such thing. After a debate of three hours, Mr. Henderson carried his point and the delegates voted to place the whole question on the agenda of the Assembly of the League of Nations.

Because of Cuba's objection, the Council of the League of Nations decided that it could not now put into effect the protocol revising the World Court Statute. The

amendment provided for fifteen judges instead of the present system of eleven judges and four deputy judges. The

Council Agenda new amendment will be partially saved, however, since under the present statute, the Council and Assembly can increase the number of judges to fifteen and the deputies to six. A committee was appointed to consider proposing this increase to the Assembly under the present provision. The revised statute, which Elihu Root joined in framing and recommending to Court members, contained a new method for putting this increase in force. It made the usual ratifications unnecessary by providing that the Council could put the statute in force if no member of the Court formally objected this year. It was to this idea of taking an important step without ratifications that Cuba objected.—The departure of Foreign Minister Grandi of Italy for home, on the eve of the opening of the Assembly of the League caused a great stir in Geneva and has given rise to numerous speculations. The official Italian explanation that in order to divide the work, Foreign Minister Grandi would attend the Council meetings while Senator Vittorio Scialoja would represent Italy at the Assembly meetings, was felt to fall far short of being a real explanation of the true reasons for Signor Grandi's departure.

The French and British points of view were sharply contrasted in the speeches of Aristide Briand and Arthur Henderson on September 11. Speaking for British Labor, Mr. Henderson declared that federation was dependent on the security which would flow from disarmament and that to reverse the order was to concert measures, not to prevent the outbreak of war, but to suppress it once it had begun. On the other hand M. Briand advocated federation as a sure basis of security which was indispensable to the reduction of armaments. Both statesmen gave emphatic personal pledges for real cooperation in the cause of peace.

Security
Debate

A series of papers on "The Freshman of 1930" will begin next week. The first will be contributed by the Rev. Maurice S. Sheehy, Ph.D., president of St. Thomas Hall at the Catholic University. While these papers are addressed to freshmen, they have an appeal for all who are interested in the Catholic college.

How a student a Newman brought out some timely words of the great Cardinal will be told by Anthony Olwell in "Newman Helps an Anglican."

John Gibbons, when in Portugal recently, found "The Village Where God Was Dead." He will tell about it next week.

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1930

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY
JOHN LAFARGE

FRANCIS X. TALBOT
CHARLES I. DOYLE
Associate Editors

WILLIAM I. LONERGAN
JAMES A. GREELEY

FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

Telephone: Medallion 3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Selling Marriage Annulments

AS not much is heard of late about the sale of indulgences, it is barely possible that some of our separated brethren have learned that indulgences are not sold. It may even be that some zealous advocate of the reformed religion actually tried to buy an indulgence, only to find that the deal could not be put through. Is it too much to hope that on this occasion he also discovered what an indulgence really is? We must not too readily look for miracles—and to enlighten a mind capable of thinking that the Church sells indulgences would seem to demand a miracle.

The place once occupied by indulgences in the solicitude of the professional anti-Catholic is now taken, quite generally, by marriage annulments. Rome, we are informed, assumes the credit, if credit there be, of forbidding divorce, but this attitude can be changed by anyone who can pay the price. Should a Catholic desire to divorce his wife, he applies to the nearest canonist, crosses the canonical palm with sundry pieces of silver, and in the argent light of these coins, the canonist will discern a reason why the marriage should be declared null and void from the beginning.

Of course, this is only the first step in the process. Other courts and chanceries must thereafter be subsidized. If the case be so difficult that the reason for nullity can be discerned only in some almost forgotten tome, or in some decree made up to suit the exigencies of the situation, more gold must be poured out. Thus it comes to pass, as Dr. Major, of Oxford, solemnly informs us, that the Catholic Church retains the credit of banning divorce and the profit derived from a thriving trade in divorce. Indeed, as more than one Protestant divine has asserted, Rome grants a divorce quite as readily as Reno.

A brief examination of the facts in the case will satisfy any reasonable inquirer. There is no divorce in the Catholic Church, in the sense that the Church dissolves a ratified and consummated marriage, giving one or both parties permission to seek a new connubial partner. The

Church does not claim to possess any such power. On the contrary, she teaches that she does not possess it. Such a marriage can be dissolved only by death.

But what about impediments?

They exist, certainly, but they are not kept in secret archives, to be disclosed only when there is question of "purchasing" an annulment. Practically all are set down in the ordinary school texts, and there are no impediments about which information will not be given freely and fully. Indeed the Church wishes these impediments to be as widely known as possible. A diriment impediment is neither a physical nor a moral disgrace, it is simply a condition, temporary or permanent, which disqualifies the individual from making a contract of marriage. Some impairments exist because of the natural or the Divine law, while others are created by the Church. Holy Orders is an example of the latter. Obviously these impediments have their force whether the individual knows of their existence or not, and they render the matrimonial contract which he attempts to make null and void. On presentation of evidence, the Church will issue a declaration to that effect.

These declarations are, however, remarkably few. Thus in 1929, the Roman Congregation of the Rota considered only fifty-nine applications, and of these thirty-eight were rejected. If the sale of annulments is a source of revenue, the Church is singularly shortsighted in rejecting so many of the few petitions which she deigns to consider. This may be explained, however, by the fact, that no fees of any kind are obligatory. When the applicant can pay the ordinary fees, which are both few and small, he is expected to pay. If he cannot, his case is not adversely affected. Should he show cause for annulment, a decree will be granted. In default of proof, it will be denied.

The Diamond Market

MANY of us were blissfully unaware of the fact, but only a few years ago, the world's diamond trade was in a most parlous state. Day after day the diamond merchants went into the market to scan the signs of the times, but for all their searching they could not learn whether it was better to buy or to sell. Returning to their homes, they were met by haggard wives and hungry children. For who can eat a diamond or quench his thirst at its lustre?

The trouble began, as such troubles usually do, in South Africa. Acres of diamonds had been discovered near the mouth of the Orange River, and within a brief period of time, gems valued at nearly forty million dollars had accumulated. At this point, the laws of economics, which take no account of beauty, began to operate. Had these gems been poured upon the market in a white flood of living light, the value of diamonds all over the world would have fallen. The South African Government therefore devised a plan of "gradual marketing." The diamonds were impounded, and released only under conditions which would keep the value from falling.

The moral of this story, told by the well known gem expert, Dr. George F. Kunz, is not very clear. Do we

value diamonds because they are beautiful or because they are rare, or because they are the most beautiful of rare things? This is a problem for the psychologist, but perhaps the moral of the story for most of us is that the world is full of a number of things, the loss of which will never make us poorer.

Lynching Ebbs and Flows

IN view of the increase of lynching within the last eighteen months, it is by no means surprising to learn that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is drafting a new Federal lynching bill. The attempt to make lynching a Federal offense has had advocates in Congress for a number of years. Eight years ago, the House passed a bill of this kind by a vote of 230 to 119, and the measure was defeated in the Senate only by means of a filibuster. A few more lynchings, and we may look for the beginning of another period of attempted "force" legislation. Eight months of 1930 show sixteen lynchings, or four more than in 1929.

It seems to us that legislation of this type would be nothing less than a calamity. We have no reason to believe that it would act as a deterrent upon a mob of ignorant sadists; and that it would spur recreant local officials to a sense of their duty is highly improbable. Officials of the proper kind need no such stimulant, and corrupt or cowardly officials would easily find a means of evading it. The sole result would be the possibility of official and private blackmail, and the actuality of a most dangerous invasion upon the rights reserved under the Constitution to the several States. The murder of men accused of crime is a sad commentary upon our alleged civilization, but if the respective States cannot cope with it, the remedy is not to be sought at Washington, but nearer home.

Lynching is not peculiar to the South. It occurs more frequently in the South simply because the bulk of the Negro population is in the South. The most disgraceful outbreak of lynching in recent years took place in Indiana. But there is no State, North or South, which lacks the right or the power to deal with this outbreak of savagery, which is not murder simply, but also contempt of legitimate authority, and rebellion. There is no State in the Union so devoid of upright and law-abiding citizens that it cannot muster a mighty host of civilizing agencies to put an end to these frightful outbreaks.

Examine the localities in which lynchings occur, and in almost every instance a neighborhood will be uncovered in which education is a sham and religion is a cloak for hypocrisy or political aims. Possibly the deterioration in religion will be the more obvious to the trained observer, but it will also be found, as a general rule, that, poor as the educational programs are, they are administered by teachers and officials in whose hands the best programs would fail.

The remedy, then, does not lie in Federal legislation, but in an awakening of all the forces of righteousness in every community. Should legislation of the model proposed by Congressman Dyer, of Missouri, be enacted, it would certainly be contested, and almost certainly would

be voided by the Supreme Court. States disgraced by lynching might be harassed for a brief period, or even be fined, but the net result, in our judgment, would be resentment on part of the local officials, increased unwillingness to curb the local lynchers, and a new horde of Federal officials, ruled by a political appointee at Washington.

We sincerely trust that the campaign inaugurated by the National Association will act as a warning to the backward States. That it will culminate in the enactment of Federal legislation, we seriously doubt. But we have little doubt that, in the end, such legislation would aggravate rather than decrease the evil of lynching.

Using Boys to Advantage

LAST month our new Federal Director of Prohibition founded a school for the higher education of all Prohibition agents. Now, no one, not even the most bigoted of wets, can possibly object to any attempt to educate a Prohibition agent, although he may deem it so much of love's labor lost. But Mr. Woodcock began with high hopes. His confidence in the power of education, or of what looks like it, to broaden the intelligence, and to polish the manners, of a Prohibition agent so that he would emerge from the process with all the finer qualities of Lord Chesterfield, the Cheeryble Brothers, and Sherlock Holmes, admitted no bounds.

But like many another founder, Mr. Woodcock has discovered that a school is one of many desirable things in this muddled old world, that simply cannot be made to order. He has also discovered that the distance between what a founder would like to do and what, after taking the academic latitude and longitude, a founder must do, is nothing less than incommensurable.

To begin with, Mr. Woodcock was unfortunate in the choice of his Dean, one H. M. Dengler, for Mr. Dengler promptly proceeded to say things which Mr. Woodcock was obliged to disown. Yet it seems hard that Mr. Dengler should bear all the blame. In his simple way, he thought it not a bad idea that Prohibition agents should be trained to detect the presence of unhallowed beverages in homes and warehouses, and their still more unhallowed passage through the streets of our sanctified cities, under the convoy of gunmen, bootleggers, and other prominent mercantile leaders. In this, public opinion will side with Mr. Dengler, since there are cases on record which show that Prohibition agents are often quite unable to recognize whiskey, even in the strongest light. While this ignorance is a tribute to the innocence and purity of their lives, it does seem to lessen their efficiency as Prohibition agents.

Mr. Dengler therefore set himself to remedy this defect, and the policy he hit upon evinced a strikingly accurate knowledge of current social conditions among the young. Very few persons born before the era of Prohibition, he reflected, are acquainted with the demon Rum, or with his multifarious kith and kin; on the other hand, most boys and girls are on good terms with the whole diabolical family. In the old days the chief temple of the demon was the saloon which, as a rule, excluded children,

but as his modern shrine is the home, the children quickly learn to know him.

With this knowledge in hand, Mr. Dengler counselled the agents to make friends with the small boy. Should any agent come across a canister of some strange liquid, obviously not water, and quite as obviously derived from no known cow, and if as he gazed at it with a puzzled air, the canister should be placed with others upon a van, and conveyed to a restaurant of the type commonly known as a "road house," and be there received with that loud acclaim sometimes styled "whoopie"—and if, further, this process should be frequently repeated, and the said restaurant be found a place from which citizens issued to make a wavering and uncertain progress toward their respective cars or homes—then, in this case, the agent should take counsel of some small boy. "Boys," remarked Mr. Dengler, "can be used to advantage," in cases presenting aspects so cryptic and so hazardous.

Following the custom of every good teacher, Mr. Dengler went on to illustrate. One boy, he pointed out, might follow the van on his bicycle. Two other boys might engage in some game in the immediate vicinity of the suspected premises. Any clever mind could easily devise a thousand other ways of using what, in some quarters, has hitherto been deemed either a nuisance, or so much unnecessary material, "to good advantage."

Regrettably, however, a number of the newspapers objected to this method of turning small boys into snoopers, and of bringing them into contact with undesirable characters. Whether these journals had the bootleggers in mind when they spoke of undesirable characters, or the Prohibition agents, is not quite clear; but in any case, Mr. Woodcock at once ordered Mr. Dengler to forget about the boys, and thereupon left Washington for a long trip, of which the chief purpose, he said, was "to carry the case of Prohibition to the people." His travels will carry him as far as the Pacific, and at their happy conclusion, "I expect to know a good deal more," said Mr. Woodcock, "about Prohibition enforcement."

We are no prophet, but we venture a forecast. Mr. Woodcock will shortly know so much about this noisome nuisance, or this noble experiment, as one may choose to view it, that he will resign his office. As an honest and an intelligent man, he will realize that he is miscast in the role of Mrs. Partington.

A Curb on Greed

THE attempt of Governor Roosevelt, of New York, to confer with the public-utility companies of the State in the revision of schedules, is worthy of imitation. Frankly, we do not think that the Governor's attempts will meet with any success in the near future. What we praise in his attitude is the fact that it is an outgrowth of his belief that the protection of the people is the first duty of the State. We hope that it will be as widely imitated as it deserves.

Governor Roosevelt understands that rights must be respected wherever they exist. He also understands that while the rights of huge corporations are in no danger

whatever in this legalistic age, the rights of the people are. He proposes to do what he can to put them beyond jeopardy. The task which lies before him is difficult, but not impossible to an intelligent and courageous man. It is not only fitting but imperatively necessary that the State attack it at once.

The problem which exists in the Empire State exists in every State. The sale of public utilities must be regulated to avoid confiscation on the one hand, and exploitation of the poor on the other. We do not pretend that problem is easy. But we must not forget that one of the gravest duties of the State is to protect the citizen against the greed of utility companies demanding an exorbitant price for commodities absolutely necessary for decent subsistence. This duty has been taken too lightly in the past. Today, it is heavy, but it can and must be fulfilled in the interest of the common good.

More Trouble in the South

IN some respects the organization of unions in the Southern States, undertaken last year, has made remarkable progress. More than 100 locals have been formed, embracing five central labor bodies, with memberships in excess of 50,000. South Carolina leads in the number of locals, followed by Alabama, Tennessee and North Carolina.

All this is progress, but we regret to learn that not a few of the unions have been planned on a war basis. According to Paul J. Smith, chief organizer for the union, the employers have not been idle, particularly in the textile industries, so that at the present moment, labor faces a crisis. The employers have set up a plan for "industrial democracy," which, according to Mr. Smith, is merely another name for the company union. It is further alleged that wherever the union gains entrance, many companies find an excuse to evict workers from the company-owned houses, to close their recreation and welfare centers, or to discharge men who have been notably active in union affairs.

We pass no judgment on the particular cases alleged by Mr. Smith, but apart from them, there seems to be no reason for thinking that the difficulties in the Southern textile fields are at an end, or are nearing an end. Almost a year ago, Governor Gardner, of North Carolina, admitting plainly that the textile mill owners were by no means faultless, invited the unions and the owners to meet in conference. As far as can be ascertained, that invitation went unheeded, and the Governor's attempt to set on foot an investigation by the legislature, fell through. Both sides sat back to nurse their grievances, and to prepare for a new war. That sort of thing may please the extremists on both sides, but it is death to the worker and to his family.

It may be war, and it may be glorious, but it is the worker who must foot the bill.

Why not organize on a peace basis, or, at least, on a basis looking for a conference that can lead to industrial peace? The war policy has failed so often that it should be junked by both owners and workers.

Cant and Catholic Education

G. K. CHESTERTON

(Copyright, 1930)

IT is always amusing to notice that modern men are more and more driven to an alternative between Catholicism and Cant. I mean that, in order to avoid a Catholic conclusion, they have to fall back on a sort of talk of the times, which is already behind the times. They use phrases that are at once fashionable and old-fashioned, and attack the Church with words of which even the world is weary.

This blast of dulness is the more startling when it comes from minds that are not intrinsically dull, but sometimes in their way distinguished. And an extraordinary example occurred recently in the form of an article by Dean Inge against religious education, or what (having abandoned himself to a ceaseless clatter of clichés), he called sectarian education.

In this article he reverses all the engines of his intellect, and backs desperately in the direction of everything else that he detests; with the sole object of avoiding contact with Catholicism. If he will pardon the Irish bull (which after all is better than a Papal Bull) he hastily surrenders to everything that he hates most in order to attack the one thing that he hates more.

Thus he dislikes State Socialists a great deal more than I do; having no sympathy even with their just indignation against social injustice. Yet in this article he writes like the very flattest and most mechanical State Socialist, mentioning the State again and again as if it were the only sacred thing, dismissing all domestic and individual traditions; scorning even to answer the plea that parents might be consulted, except by saying that children are a good deal more important than parents, "from the point of view of the State."

In short, he talks as if there could be no possible point of view except the point of view of the State. He might be any Bolshevik bureaucrat or any Fabian expert of the Socialistic sort that he has abused in a hundred sermons and articles.

But however often he has abused Socialists, there is something that he hates much more than he hates Socialism. It is the same in every aspect of the article. He is a man who attaches rather too much importance to breed and family; yet he argues here as if the family did not exist at all.

He has often expressed a healthy contempt for cheap cheerfulness about progress and the sort of swindling optimism that is always pretending to pay its bills by drawing blank cheques on the future. Yet in this article he is as bright and breezy as any Salesman with a Slogan. "The modern State is feeling its way towards new ideas of Nature, of man, and of society, and hopes that public education may promote a social unity out of which, perhaps, a new religious unity may at last grow." Which is far worse than Wells at his very worst, in the matter of vagueness, and is without that inner sincerity which still

gives strength to the Wellsian style. For that sort of unmeaning hope is really the religion of Mr. Wells; but it is not and never was the religion of Dean Inge. He is only using that religion as a desperate weapon against another religion. It is a difference, as I have said, that runs through the very style.

Dean Inge is a man who can write very fine, clear and classic English. Yet in this article he writes journalese; he thinks journalese; except when he writes it without thinking at all.

I call it thinking journalese, for instance, to write like this:

If we are to work our way to a new integration in religion, more in keeping with modern scientific and social ideas than the old traditional forms, which in some respects are antiquated, this plan of scattering the pupils among sectarian teachers for the religious lesson is essentially retrograde, and ought not to be tolerated in schools under State control.

There is not a word in that wordy paragraph that is not a stock phrase over which any intelligent person will stumble, and want to kick it out of his path. Everybody who believes in a religion believes he has the right integration in religion; and it is not our fault if the Dean of St. Paul's has not found any right religion yet.

To go on with, even if he were still looking for a right integration in religion, who in the world would try to find it by founding schools to teach the religion he had not found, or the irreligion with which he was admittedly discontented? Are we to vivisection school children like rabbits in order to find the truth that we are to teach them? Why must the right integration be in keeping with modern scientific and social ideas, if these represent only one period in the present, and differ as much from those of the future as from those of the past? What are modern social ideas, in a world in which men differ as much as Dean Inge differs from the Socialists? What traditional forms in what respects are antiquated, and does he mean those that belong most to antiquity? Prayer, for instance? What are sects except sections of something, and what were the denominations sections of, except of the Catholic Church? What is being essentially retrograde? Is it, for instance, retrograde to regret the Victorian Age or the English public school predominance, or the old capitalism, or all the things that the Dean of St. Paul's reveres and regrets?

And when we come to what education is really to be, we come upon a mere blank. I gather, in his own phrase, that morals are to be caught like measles. It is an unfortunate parallel, for measles are infectious and health is not. And if he imagines he can produce anything, even the English gentleman of the Victorian public schools, without teaching him some rules about cleanliness and health and similar things, he will find out what journalese gibberish does really produce, if you put it into practice.

But of course he never dreamed, when he was a school-

master, of acting on any such absurd principle. He did not think that boys would catch Greek by contagion, or would naturally come out in spots of decimal fractions.

Nor indeed does he sustain such a position consistently, even through one article. Before the end of the two columns, we find that we are to have moral and religious lessons after all; though the first part of the proposal amounts to saying that we should be careful to choose religious men and then forbid them to teach religion.

However, the following sentence has a curious simplicity and charm: "Under some neutral heading such as 'Civic and Personal Duties' a great deal of Christian teaching might be introduced."

I grieve to note this dark and crooked priestcraft learnt from the infamous Jesuits, in the educational policy of the Dean of St. Paul's. It is distressing to find him, a dark figure gliding noiselessly behind the arms insinuating religious teaching under entirely neutral headings.

But what is neutral, except the neutral headings? Let us cut through all this nonsensical network of words, and see how we really stand with moral education, let alone religious education.

What are our Civic and Personal Duties? How much of the old outworn Christian prejudice against polygamy or murder are we allowed to "introduce" under that neutral heading? Should a man keep his marriage vow? Is that a Personal Duty? If it is, then three-quarters of the theory and practice of modern marriage and divorce is evil.

Should people artificially prevent birth? All Christians said "No" until yesterday; all Catholics say "No" today. How does anybody propose to make a common morality, let alone a common religion, out of these differences?

All this talk of teaching the duties of citizenship is cant and claptrap, when there are such violent contrasts between what St. Augustine called the City of Babylon and the City of God.

An aged Victorian might be excused for saying, what seemed plausible about 1860, that on morality most of us agree. But a brisk and promising progressive, moving on to new ideas of nature, of man, and of society, "in touch with modern scientific and social ideas," ought to know by this time that it is exactly about morality that we do disagree.

In all this, I have commented on things self-evident to all educated English people; or, in other words, on things about which Dean Inge really ought to know better. But I cannot close without referring to the larger aspect, which he really might not understand and certainly would not admit that he understands.

The reason why we will not surrender our religious education to admixture or compromise is that we regard it as the only complete and universal education of a human being. We will not, if we can help it, give up the human beings for whom we are directly responsible to any education that is less complete, less universal and less human. Educational systems more narrow, or even more dehumanized, may have their elements of good, and it may be right that some people should have these elements when they can have no other. But we will not narrow or main-

our own universal culture, to copy these local accidents.

In saying this, I know I am saying what many good Protestants really do not understand; but it is true. To take only one example; to my mind anybody who grows up without the tradition and conception of the Mother of God is a half-educated person. He may be an excellent person; as may the Iconoclast brought up to have a horror of statues. But we will not give up the human heritage of sculpture to please the Iconoclast; and we will not give up the mystical exaltation of the Mother and the Woman Clothed with the Sun to please the Puritan who has been told that she is an idol. The whole range of European sculpture, painting, poetry, and festivity is there to show that she is not an idol, but an idea inherent in the whole European civilization from which we come.

If there was one thing that was the soul of Europe, and rather especially of England, it was the love of Our Lady. And when we say that we will have schools in which such a power is present, we merely mean that we will have children educated adequately, and not inadequately, and children not cheated of their heritage.

Fun for the Workingman

AUGUSTINE SMITH

I ALWAYS look forward to the competitive examinations held by the dean of American inventors for the purpose of selecting a probable successor to himself. The questions did duly appear in the papers, and after racking my brains I found I would have made a ridiculously low score had I taken the examination. This is an interesting pastime, but there is one I looked forward to with still more avidity, and that was reading the *obiter dicta* of some of our industrial geniuses who graced the festivities at East Orange, expertly managed by a prince of press agents.

Henry Ford, who makes automobiles, was quoted in the *New York Times* as saying that shut-downs of plants *should* come in the middle of the summer, for that is the time for vacations in the United States. "Then the people can put up a tent in a corner and live or go touring in their car."

The workingman is an ungrateful wretch. Here we see the touching spectacle of a captain of industry suggesting something for which the workingman should be undyingly grateful—namely, shutting down a plant and giving the worker a well-earned rest. And is the workingman grateful? Not at all. He actually *wants* to work. He complains about, of all things, unemployment. He says even a few weeks' shut-down works a hardship on him. How utterly absurd! He does not realize that three weeks' or a month's or a two months' or even a year's period of "leisure" is good for him. Think of the cultural advantages! He can "go touring in his car." Think of the broadening influence of travel; think of the charming and elevating contacts with one's fellows in the tourist "tent cities" of the great West, where one can live the life of a bum in the grand style. I need not go into the gorgeous sights to be seen in these States—the giant trees of California, Yellowstone Park, etc., etc.

And is the workingman grateful? Again, no. Instead of folding up his tents like the Arabs, he obstinately remains at home—and probably starves.

Moreover, the ungrateful wretch refuses to do his bit to aid industry. By staying so obstinately at home, he spends no money for tires, gasoline, and even puts honest tent makers out of work by refusing to buy a tent. Any economist of today will gladly inform you that industry does not depend on living wages, but on spending. And still there are old fogies who prefer to try living in a house rather than spend a few dollars for a tent. But then I imagine even St. Paul found tent making a rather hard business sometimes.

So we see great industries trying to make life pleasant for the workingman; and the workingman refuses to be amused. He probably remains just as unmoved by the observation of the great captain of industry just spoken of, who also confessed that one of the needs of America is more bathtubs! The gentleman said that they should be made cheaper so that everybody could have them. As it is, only about one family in ten has one. In contradistinction to this attitude the workingman would probably agree with the late Vice-President Marshall that what the country really needs is a good five-cent cigar. Of course, the workingman does not realize how bad smoking is for the health and how it cuts down efficiency in the shop.

After I read the story in the *Times*, I was faintly disturbed by the thought that somebody was being "kidded," and that somebody seemed to me to be the workingman—which is nothing unusual. The remarks of the gentleman at the publicity orgy over at East Orange seem to present a new trend in the *apologia* for unemployment which this country is attempting to toss off nonchalantly on the one hand, and yet affects to take seriously on the other. You may have read that we have a new commission to gather statistics on unemployment. Statistics butter no parsnips, but it is nice to have the people think that they do.

The remarks which we have just examined would lead one to believe that what the workingman worries about and calls by the unpleasant name of unemployment is not so in reality; it is that much more pleasing and delightful thing extolled by the poets—leisure. Mr. Ford develops this argument still further in one of our leading weekly periodicals. He points to the fact that the Saturday half-holiday is nowhere regarded as a period of unemployment—it is a period of leisure.

If I may be permitted in my own humble way, I would like to suggest a point of interest to those who hold this leisure idea. Leisure is free time from work, during which time a man may recreate his forces, and generally improve himself. It is a time for enjoyment of those things which will help him gain this end. Now enjoyment is impossible if it is clouded by a feeling of economic uncertainty. How can one be happy and enjoy oneself if one does not know how the next quart of milk for the baby is to be paid for? If leisure is of this sort, it will make the workingman a dull, unambitious automaton. That is just what the workingman is accused of being, and I will not say it is totally untrue. He is accused of not

having the stamina and energy to do big things for himself, but rather prefers to avail himself of the fruits of someone else's energy by becoming the employe of that someone else. Sometimes the employer forgets that the gifts of stamina, energy, and the like are not given to all.

The gentleman whose opinions we have been discussing also feels that when a "slack" season comes to industry, it is better to close down the plants than to operate at a little loss to the owner or the shareholders. He sees no economic value in putting up buildings or "making jobs" merely in order to keep men occupied and paid and fed, though he also feels we should all buy more cars to keep the "country" prosperous. I may be an incurable idealist, but it seems to me that even though such work was not needed by the firm, it would be a help to the workingman, and after all he should be considered.

The only time an industry, it seems to me, could justify closing its plants in order to save money for itself, will be when that firm or industry pays a living wage sufficient to enable the worker to save enough to tide himself and his family over such periods of unemployment. It is a truism to say that the wages paid the average workingmen are not sufficient to warrant that at the present time.

Therefore, until such time as a living wage is paid workers to enable them, if they live sanely and sensibly and in their own class, to save enough to tide them over shut-downs and lay-offs, all this talk about the danger of confusing leisure with unemployment is a sop thrown to the public to stifle its senses with false hopes, and to make it see in great corporations true lovers of humanity.

Meanwhile, let shut-downs come in the summer when the workingmen can "put up a tent in a corner and live or go touring in their car." That is the greatest kindness they can expect from Big Business.

THE BROTHERS

Hairy and hearty
And like as two peas,
The whole village jumps
When they let off a sneeze.

One is called Joe
And the other called Jan,
And they pick up a living
The best way they can.

Cleaning the school out
Is nine shillings sure,
But no one could call it
A sinny-ne-cure:

And, though 'tis good pickings,
You'll never grow rich
With mending a puncture
Or digging a ditch;

Or carving a ship
For Squire's little boy,
And laying of pipes
For the new rezzy-voy:

'Tis regular labor
Makes regular gains:
But they're each of 'em happy
And never complains.

L. A. G. STRONG.

What Do the Colored Catholics Want?

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

ON a few blocks of St. Antoine Street, in Detroit, live Italians, Greeks (with Olympic-titled restaurants), Hindus, Turks, Jesuits (at the Jefferson Avenue end) and Fathers of the Holy Ghost (at the Monroe end of the section); not to speak of some lone Germans, loyal remnants of the faithful multitude who built St. Mary's Church, school, and parish hall. But on Sunday, August 31, church and hall were turned over by the friendly Germans and their whole-souled Pastor, Father Frederick T. Hoeger, C.S.Sp., to the representatives of the Federated Colored Catholic Societies of the United States. They came at the invitation of His Lordship, the Bishop of Detroit; they thronged the magnificent old church at a solemn Mass, sung by the venerable Father Wuest, C.S.Sp., for nearly forty years pastor of St. Mary's; assisted by Father Charles A. Kapp, C.S.Sp., pastor of St. Peter Claver's Church, and Father Theodore Hohler, of the Marianhill Mission Fathers, both of whom were tireless in preparing the fine program of reception.

After Mass the Bishop spoke to them words of cordial greeting, and imparted to them the special blessing of Our Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, which was transmitted to the Convention by His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate, with the following letter:

My dear Friends:

It has been made known to our Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, that you are meeting in your Sixth Annual Convention at Detroit under the patronage of the Right Rev. Michael J. Gallagher, Bishop of Detroit.

Through His Cardinal Secretary of State His Holiness has charged me to convey to you His Apostolic Blessing as an earnest of the happy results which promise to follow from the deliberations of your conference.

For my own part, permit me to add my cordial wishes for the success of your convention and for the perfect accomplishment of the noble objects of your Federation, particularly its efforts in behalf of the Catholic education of your people.

I note with pleasure the subjects which have been chosen for discussion before this convention, and I pray that your Federation's cause may be ever more prosperously advanced and continue to give tangible expression to its loyalty to the Holy Father and the Church.

Wishing you every blessing, I am . . .

There is no doubt that everyone left the Convention with a clearer idea than he brought with him on what the Catholic Negro wants. Not only were white men and women of good will invited; they were asked to enrol themselves in the Federation. Only by their presence in good numbers can its full purpose be made known.

Saturday's deliberations, which were done jointly with the Catholic Industrial Conference and the N.C.W.C. Social Action Department, studied some of the facts of the Negroes' actual conditions, and many of the principles that apply to them. Monday's program, that of the Federation proper, dealt with the practical remedy for his conditions, as found in the religious and social program of the Church, embodied in Catholic Action.

Any danger of tedium was dispelled by the musical program, especially by the superb band of youngsters whom Father Leo M. Walsh, "the Negro's Daniel O'Connell," brought with him from Cincinnati. Every boy in that great band was a Catholic and every one a convert to the Faith; and, added Father Walsh, every one of them a gentleman. They looked it and acted it; and, those who heard Father Walsh's plain but fervent testimony to what Catholic priests and Sisters are doing for the Negro had no doubt that he, too, lived up to his reputation.

The industrial situation especially in Detroit, was described in detail by Donald Marshall, head of the colored personnel—12,000 in number—of the Ford plants in Detroit, and by Dr. Karl Phillips, United States Commissioner of Conciliation, Washington, D. C. John C. Dancy, Jr., Industrial Secretary of the Detroit Urban League, described housing and recreational and other social conditions in Detroit, and the efforts being made to improve them. These speakers (all Negroes) made it absolutely plain that serious and baseless discrimination against the Negro does exist in industry. Twenty-two national unions, stated Mr. Marshall, entirely exclude Negro members; others make membership virtually impossible. Henry Ford alone in Detroit industries makes a principle of non-discrimination. Yet the frequently used plea of incompatibility between white and colored workmen is shown by experience to be baseless. Unsocial traits can and should be removed by proper education. For, as Dr. Phillips said, it is frequently the little things, ways of talking and conducting himself towards his fellows, rather than actual lack of skill or efficiency, which stand in the colored workman's way.

Peculiarly painful and handicapping is the withholding of credit facilities, which are an indispensable tool of self-improvement for the modern workman. Yet sharp racial discrimination was noted in that respect on the part of the banks, while testimonies were quoted as to the Negro workman's faithfulness in meeting his credit obligations. The establishment of credit unions was urged by afternoon speakers as a partial remedy for this handicap.

Coming down to principles, Father William A. Bolger, C.S.C., of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn., showed, with skilled argument, based on the teachings of Leo XIII, how the working man can never hope for justice unless the true purpose of the economic order is recognized, viz., that it should provide every man with the opportunity of earning a decent livelihood.

Father Francis J. Gilligan, of St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., pushed the matter of principle on to the crucial question of who is morally responsible for industrial discrimination based on race alone. For religion and morality, he insisted, have a definite bearing on the racial situation as such; and this bearing must be plainly stated if our moral teaching is to be complete. His conclusion was that the denial of industrial opportunity to

a man on racial grounds when no adequate plea of inefficiency can be alleged, and when there is no bona-fide danger of a notable disturbance of the peace, is unjust action on the part both of employer and white employee. For the social office of the employer places him in a position of definite responsibility towards his fellow-man. And strikes, if for merely racial considerations, wreak injustice not only on the Negro, who has the right to be free from unfair interference, but on the employer as well, who has the right to do what he should.

In the Convention of the Federation itself an entirely constructive program was offered. Ten different phases of Catholic Action were chosen as movements particularly calculated to benefit the condition of the Catholic colored population at large. Protests alone would not remedy conditions. In his presidential address on Sunday evening, Dr. Thomas W. Turner, of Hampton Institute, Va., showed the need of encouraging positive, constructive, Catholic movements, since Holy Mother Church has within herself remedies for all the ills of her children, temporal as well as spiritual. At Monday's meeting, presided over by Attorney George W. B. Conrad, of Cincinnati, First Vice-President of the Federation, these various phases of Catholic Action, or nation-wide movements, were explained by competent members of the Federation in ten-minute talks or papers, the whole being followed by a brief discussion. Speakers were announced as follows: one or two last-minute substitutions taking place: Education, Mrs. Margaret Cope, of Chicago; The Catholic Press and Literature, W. J. James, of St. Louis; The Retreat Movement, Elmo Anderson, of New York City; The Sodality of the Blessed Virgin, the Rev. Daniel Lord, S.J., of St. Louis; Participation in National Catholic Activities, Mrs. M. Johnston, of Chicago; Industrial and Social Problems, Miss M. V. Seals, of Columbus, Ohio; Young People's Welfare, Mrs. Viola McKenny, of Washington, D. C.; The Rural Life Movement, Victor H. Daniel, of Ridge, Md.; The Liturgical Movement, Noah D. Thompson, of New York City; Home and Foreign Missions, Frank L. Mitchell, of Boston; The Inter-Racial Movement, Byron Peters, of Pittsburgh.

Amongst these, Mr. Anderson's address was a particularly fervent call for participation in the nation-wide laymen's retreat movement as a means of forming intelligent lay leaders, and specially recommended by our present Holy Father. A separate resolution urging all colored Catholic laymen, particularly officers of the Federation, to make an annual closed retreat, was adopted. Father Lord's appeal for the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin as a means of cultivating personal holiness as well as practical Catholicism brought out from the audience the fact that many existing colored sodalities in this country lacked the requisite affiliation with the Roman Sodality. Miss Seals, in her talk, dwelt on the comparatively favorable employment situation which she found in Columbus, as compared with other cities. The papers, with all the proceedings of the Convention, will be published in the *Chronicle*, the Federation's official organ, for October (2721 Pine Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.).

In the course of the discussions, however, a challenge

was flung down on the floor of the Convention. "Are the colored Catholics ready to *state precisely* what they want?" The speaker would admit of no evasion. The answer must be yes or no. The Catholic-Action program was the final answer to that challenge, for it offered a remedy. But there still remained the definite statement: "What do colored Catholics want? What do they *not* want?" The eyes of the country are now upon them? Where do they stand?

The way this challenge was met showed, I think, no small courage and self-restraint. The statement was too vital a thing, too capable of misinterpretation, to be made off-hand, either on floor or in committee-room. It was decided to work it out at leisure; and then to submit it to their fellow-Catholics as the official expression of the Federation's mind. I do not want to anticipate that statement by anything I say in this article. No one single person is competent to formulate it. Nevertheless, from what the writer has seen and heard at this and at other gatherings, the following may be safely hazarded.

They want to earn a decent livelihood; free from interference based merely on racial attitudes.

They want such opportunity to extend to all legitimate forms of gainful employment, and to include adequate means of self-improvement through credit, housing facilities, recreation, and other public utilities.

They want their boys to be priests and their girls to be nuns.

They want such educational facilities as will fit their boys to be priests and their girls to be nuns.

They want to educate all their boys and girls in Catholic schools, from the primary school to the university, according to each one's native ability.

They want admission to Catholic institutions already frequented by the general body of white pupils (1) where the denial of such admission is not prescribed by law, as it is in the Southern States; (2) where such denial involves the loss of a tangible good, to which as Catholics and human beings they may legitimately lay claim; (3) where such exclusion is based on purely racial considerations, and not on objective standards of conduct, capacity, or decorum.

They want to attend Holy Mass and the services of the Church, to receive the Sacraments, and hear the Word of God, without suffering humiliating inconveniences based neither on the law of the land, nor on the practices of the Universal Church, nor on any objective, remediable conditions of the group, but merely on racial considerations.

They want the practical charity of Catholics to aid them in obtaining such churches, schools, or welfare institutions, as will specially benefit their group, when, as a group, they experience special needs, due to depressed and disadvantageous conditions, location, poverty, vocational handicaps, etc.; when such establishments will be understood as fitting them for taking their full part in the life of the Church and the nation, and shall in no wise be looked upon as a means of excluding them from advantages legitimately theirs.

They do not want "social equality," in the obnoxious sense attached to this word.

They do not want to interfere with the comfort or peace of mind of their white brethren, any more than can be helped. They do not wish to push themselves where they are not desired, but only to obtain the goods that God Himself wishes them to desire.

They do not want to be treated as "a problem," but as a multitude of human beings, sharing a common destiny, and the common privilege of the Redemption.

I am neither condemning nor defending these expressions: I am merely recording them. From what I saw at Detroit and at other gatherings I judge they are in the minds of most intelligent Catholic Negroes today.

What will be the white Catholic's response? Father Wainsborough, of England (I hope I spell his name right: he is a convert, a former labor leader), told us that the only answer was: "Practical Christianity," and that it was a strange thing that after nineteen hundred years the simplest propositions of justice had to be proved to Catholics like a scientific theorem. Only through the reasoned principles of Christian charity, he stated, can justice be obtained. If our white Catholics of every description, priests and laymen, and diocesan and national organizations, will cooperate with the Federation in carrying out its program of Catholic Action—including interracial adjustment as itself a phase of Catholic Action—charity will see that justice shall be done.

Has Science Disproved Religion?

HILAIRE BELLOC

(Copyright, 1930)

I WAS reading the other day a statement summarily delivered to the world by one of those popular writers, whose name I forget—it may have been H. G. Wells—that science had got rid of religion.

It is one of those sayings which are repeated for the mere sake of repeating them an indefinite number of times, and which have no relation to reality whatsoever. These parrot cries are the peculiar mark of the days in which we live; though it is only fair to admit that we have inherited them from an older time in which they were still more common. Things of that sort were said when I was a boy even more monotonously and regularly than they are today. So we are getting along after all, and, as the Greek cynic said, "Courage, lads! I see land!"

Let us ask ourselves (and the people who talk in this strange old-fashioned way) exactly what they mean.

In the first place: What do they mean by the word *science*? If they mean an atheist or materialist habit of mind they are quite right. But why call that "science"? You might as well call a dislike of music "scholarship." If they are using the word to mean something different from the ordinary dictionary meaning they ought to tell us so.

The ordinary meaning of the word *science* is this: A set of facts established by evidence so strong that the contrary to them cannot be admitted.

For instance: science teaches us that the earth is round: that certain bodies have certain chemical effects on other bodies, etc. It is science for that matter that heat boils

water and that soap cleans clothes, or that unsupported heavy bodies fall to the ground. Anything is science which is part of repeated measurable experience, and can be confirmed by an appeal to a further experience of the same kind.

This great body of ascertained fact to which we have added a good deal in the last hundred years (but nothing compared to what we had already acquired in past centuries) is said by people who are either loose thinkers or uneducated, or both, to have "got rid of religion."

Well, then, what do they mean by "religion"?

That word *religion* is more difficult to define than the word *science*. People use the word *religion* in all sorts of senses from the vaguest to the most precise. It may be used in the most general sense to mean nothing more than man's anxiety about his own nature, its fate and its relation to the universe. It may be used in the most particular sense to mean a certain system of doctrine, under which answers are given to the great questions upon man's nature, and fate and relation to the universe.

In the general sense of the word *religion* there can be no question of science having got rid of it, for the simple reason that ascertained physical facts about the material universe do not correspond to the subject matter of religion. Science can no more destroy "religion" in that general sense than poisons can destroy mathematics, or that grammar can destroy the rotation of the globe. Its facts cannot touch the principal questions asked by the soul on man's nature and destiny.

That is why these questions are so troubling. If by physical experiment you could discover whether man were immortal or no, the matter would have been settled long ago.

It is on the *particular* definition of religion that the challenge is made. Science is supposed (when this foolish phrase is used) to have destroyed certain definite religious doctrines by disproving them. This sort of people have at the back of their heads a vague idea that in some way or other the physical science which they have learnt at the mechanic's institute or in popular lectures on chemistry and physics and history has disproved Catholic dogma. Therefore, the challenge that can be put to them is perfectly simple: "What Catholic dogma has been disproved by what scientific fact?" That obvious elementary challenge they never attempt to meet.

"Is it the dogma of the Incarnation? Or of the Real Presence? Or of a personal God? Or of immortality?" Obviously it is none of these. Is it the dogma of free will? Is it the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope? Hardly! Is it the dogma of moral responsibility, and of the real existence of right and wrong? Exactly how does the examination of chemical reactions, strata of the earth, old documents, the behavior of electrical phenomena, upset any one Catholic dogma? If so, which dogma, and how?

They never answer; and the reason they never answer is that they do not know what Catholic dogma is. They go on repeating the attack which nineteenth-century discovery delivered against legend, myth and wrong interpretation of texts under the impression that these errors are in some way part of Catholic doctrine, but they don't

specify a particular doctrine because they are ignorant of what doctrines have been defined and in what sense.

I have used the word "never." It is not quite accurate. Sometimes one of them does try to pick out a particular doctrine which scientifically established fact disproves. But as, whenever they do this, they expose their own ignorance, the examples are getting rarer and rarer.

There was an effort a little while ago to get rid of the Fall of Man by proofs drawn from the science of geology. It was wide of the mark, but it had one good effect: it taught quite a number of people just what the doctrine of the Fall is.

Dr. Barnes came out in print with the strange statement that the Real Presence was subject to chemical analysis. He received so many such replies from every instructed source—many of them non-Catholic—that he is not likely to repeat the blunder.

In spite of the dwindling in numbers of these howlers, however, the vague statement still lives, is constantly repeated for popular consumption—and is popularly consumed. Whenever we hear it we can stop it dead by that conclusive question: "What doctrine has science refuted or destroyed?" It is easy to put and it ought to be easy to answer. For the answer is "None."

More Words to My Next Nurse

JAMES FITZGERALD

AT the end of my former discourse aimed at you, my imaginary and (I hope you will not think me ungallant) wholly hypothetical nurse, I summed up what I wanted from you as follows: I want you to help me to adjust myself to one or other of these four serious situations: (1) to the approaching crisis of my illness, (2) to the after-effects on myself of that crisis safely passed, (3) to the realization that I am done for, or (4) finally, to the verdict that, while I am not going to die forthwith, medical science has done all it can and it is not enough and I am going to be chronically sick for what remains of my life. I promised that if you had patience to listen further to me, I would another time go further into the whole business with you. Well, you have, with a grace I had hardly dared expect, consented to listen and I keep my promise.

Take the first: helping me adjust myself to the approaching crisis.

I was invited one time by a surgeon friend of mine to observe what he called a very rare and nice operation. The case was one of some kind of malignant growth on the spine. The surgeon had seen pictures of this growth in books and had even removed it from cadavers but he never had had the rare opportunity of seeing it in a living body. He was very interested. I was allowed to see the patient prepared for the operation. What I saw was an old man, a very sick old man, and a very, very scared old man. Scared? He was in a state of absolute and morbid fright. One look at his ashen face and wild eyes was enough to tell anyone with common sense that he was in the throes of an emotional crisis that would lessen his chances for recovery.

He was trying to talk as they prepared him but the words wouldn't come and nobody paid any attention to him. Oh, yes, they were very attentive to his body, they were preparing that carefully, deftly, even tenderly, but they weren't paying any attention to his fright. And the last sound out of him as they clapped the cone over his face was a cry of terror cut in half. Well, I didn't see much of the operation, although it was tremendously fascinating. After a bit one of the attendants took me by the arm and led me out and sat me down and gave me a glass

of water and after a while I felt a little better. At lunch the doctor told me about it, he had got at the growth all right and removed it but the old man had died. "Sure," I said, "you need not have bothered to operate the old fellow, the fright alone would have killed him." The surgeon only told me not to be silly.

I don't presume to draw any conclusions from that one instance except this: that the preparation for that operation had induced in that patient a mental state which constituted a real illness as acute as any growth on his spine. Give me that old man without any growth on his spine and let me scare the wits out of him like that a couple of times and I'd turn you over another kind of case just as interesting as the very interesting spinal condition. Now put the two of them together, then do a major operation with all the odds against its success in any case, and what chance have you for a good recovery?

On the second point: the readjustment to new conditions after a successful passage of the crisis. There came to my attention just the other day the case of a woman who had been a fine wife and mother for eighteen years, and had raised a family of four splendid children. At thirty-nine she got sick, her family doctor made an exact diagnosis and referred her to a specialist who is in absolutely the front rank of his specialty. He operated her, pronounced the operation a success and the recovery complete. Today, that home is split wide open; the wife is a neurasthenic rapidly deteriorating into outright insanity; is infatuated with the surgeon; is a scourge to her husband, will have nothing to do with any of her children except the youngest daughter, 20 years old, of whom she has made a hypochondriac and now the psychiatrist called in, probably too late, has two cases of illness to treat, each one even more serious than the one the surgeon cured. I believe that a good sane nurse could have prevented all that by taking the trouble really to know and understand that patient, and by helping her to adjust gradually her mental and emotional life to the after-effects of that initial operation.

Especially here, in convalescence, the nurse has it in her hands whether the recovery shall be complete or partial or whether some worse ailment develops. The acute peak of

the sickness is passed, the actual danger is over, there remains the tedious return to complete health and strength. Will you let your impatient patient get too soon upon his feet and suffer a relapse, or will you stand by and watch him, reluctant to give up the center of the stage, cling to his symptoms, shrink from the stress of every-day life again and develop into a pitiful hypochondriac?

Incidentally, let me insert here that my nurse will respect my conscientious convictions against certain quite widely accepted medical practices. If she cannot support me in them against the advice of the doctors, she will at least keep her mouth shut and not add her third-hand opinions to the weight of unethical advice I am holding out against.

And for the third point. Though I hope for sympathy and understanding and interest in my reaction to my disease, I will want no silly optimism about my condition. If I am likely to die, I want no concealment of that fact and I want no delay about getting a priest because it might upset me with the thought of death. Of course, I am going to die, if not then, well another time. Do you think I am a fool that the thought of death is utterly new to me? If I am that bad that I am in danger of death, then you as my nurse owe me the still weightier obligation, even from the natural standpoint, of leaving out of play no last resource of mind or emotion or body that remains to me to fight it off, and you are utterly ignorant of the thing called man if you don't know that the very thought of death calmly and resolutely faced has a therapeutic value which in a crisis is of the highest value.

And now for the fourth point, and finally. Suppose you are my nurse and suppose I am going to be discharged without any benefit. I want you to realize that no patient need ever be discharged without benefit. Well, but suppose I get cancer and it goes beyond anything medical science has yet found to do about it. I'm incurable; I'm doomed. I beg your pardon, I am not. Doomed to what? Oh, doomed to die. I was doomed to die the day I was born. And as for cancer, what is it? You say a malignant growth of tissue in the living body. But I say it is a malignant growth in my body, with the emphasis on the "my." I say that cancer is as much a mental as a physical disease in the sense that, mind and body, I am one person and if I have cancer all of me has it. And if medical science doesn't know how to get rid of that malignant growth in my body, it doesn't follow that plain common-sense can't get rid of its malignant effects upon my mind. To illustrate this most difficult of the points let me retell you a story.

The man who tells it is John Gibbons in a book called "Tramping to Lourdes." He told it in *AMERICA* before that. It would do you good to read it. He was one of a great number of people on an English pilgrimage to Lourdes. They all had gone hoping for a miracle, some great, some small. Incidentally, there is one thing that has always struck me about the sneers of those who mock at pilgrims going to shrines hoping for miracles. They say of them pityingly: "See those thousands of fools who believe they will be cured by a miracle." It never occurs to them to say: "See those thousands

of fools who believed they would be cured by science."

Well, all these people had gone from England far into the south of France hoping for a miracle and now they were on the train coming back, nearing England and there had been no cures, not even a very little one. And this man who tells the story was feeling very sorry for them all. And then it suddenly struck him that they were all, every one of them, palpably as happy as possible about it all. And then he tells the story of just two of these happy, disappointed ones.

The man was a not-very-well-paid London clerk. The girl might have been a typist. They were very much in love with each other, had got engaged and were saving up for the furniture. Then the girl got some rare sort of disease that the local doctor could not treat and he sent her to a specialist. The specialist recommended an expensive kind of treatment that might possibly save her. So they took the furniture money and spent it and the treatment did no good. And then, they decided to try Lourdes. By this time, though, you can imagine that their money was about all gone. But they borrowed and they went to Lourdes. And now here they were coming back from the Miracle City and they had got no miracle. The girl would have to die now and that was all there was about it. Another two years or so would see the end of it all.

The man who tells the story was wondering what word he could find to say to them when he met them on the train. But, when he did see them, they were happier than any two people he had ever seen before, not resignedly happy but with that human sort of happiness that goes to the pictures on Saturday night and holds hands all the time in the dark. All their little savings were wasted, she was going to die and they were radiantly happy. And then says the man who tells the story, it hit him all in an instant. They had got their miracle! Only it had not been a miracle of the body. They had had a glimpse through that hole in the clouds called Lourdes and had seen into Eternity. There they would be for all the time that there was ever going to be, together with each other and with God and the Mother of God. And after that what did anything else matter?

The man who tells the story says he supposes he puts it rather badly (although I wish I could put things as well), but it explained things to him anyway; it explained things all down that long train full of people coming home without any cure.

I suppose I have put all this very badly to you, my next nurse, but I hope you get some idea of what I have in mind.

Outside of Lourdes and outside of miracles, that sort of thing is to my mind the peculiar and shining opportunity of the nurse—that when I am fallen sick and broken, she can help me integrate all my forces; she can help me adjust myself to the shock of the crisis, to the long convalescence, to the immediate prospect of death or she can send me back with my incurable disease to walk the world a little while longer, bravely, sanely, gaily. For sick and sad humans, she has, more than anyone else, secularly speaking, the power to let the light come through.

Education

Do Catholics Oppose the Public Schools?

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

LET us consider a statement which contains seven words, eleven syllables, and a world of unmeant evil. "Catholics do not oppose the public schools."

That statement never put a Catholic child into a Catholic school.

It never heartened a struggling priest, with a poverty-stricken flock, to hold out just a little longer, and build a Catholic school.

It never brought home to any Catholic the simple and undeniable fact that he is bound in conscience to support the Catholic school by his money, his influence, and his patronage.

It never bucked up a Catholic father, tempted to send his child to a public school, or brought him back to a realization of his solemn obligations before Almighty God.

For "after all," reflects the hard-driven priest, "Catholics do not oppose the public schools."

"Why give my money to put up a Catholic school," asks the Catholic, "when, after all, Catholics do not oppose the public schools?"

"Why should I send my little girl to the Sisters," concludes the tempted Catholic father, "when, after all, Catholics do not oppose the public school."

"It is true that at the public school she will be brought up on the theory that in education religion is hardly worth bothering about."

"It is true that in the public school she will never hear one word about Our Lord and His Holy Mother."

"It is true that in the public school the sweetest and dearest and holiest of all women will not be named to her as the model of all worthwhile womanhood."

"It is true that in the public school, she will not be taught to praise, revere, and serve Almighty God."

"But what of it? After all, Catholics do not oppose the public schools."

If the mark of a loyal Catholic is lack of opposition to the public school, as it exists in this country, then I am not a Catholic. Except for the fact of Baptism, I never was a Catholic. Further, if, *per impossibile*, to be a loyal Catholic I must sign the formula, "Catholics do not oppose the public schools," then I do not want to be a Catholic.

In this day, when the fate of the Catholic school hangs in the balance, I know of nothing better fitted to frustrate a century of Catholic struggle than that abominable, "Catholics do not oppose the public schools." It is a cry of weak despair when we need determined fighting, and a triumph of "economy" forcing us into positions which we cannot defend.

Need it be pointed out, at this late date, that the terms "public education" and "the public schools," are by no means synonymous? The first is general, the second specific. The first includes every means of education in the community, whether it be an elementary school or a

symphony orchestra. The second is a term designating one among many means.

Nor need I stress the fact that "opposition" to the public schools does not imply determination to destroy them forthwith. It may be wholly consistent with an attitude of toleration, and generally is. Nor need it be said, further, that there is no plot or purpose, either among Catholics or, as far as I know, among any group of people interested in education, to impede the legitimate operation of the public schools. Of course, every American is free to criticize them, just as he is free to criticize any other political institution, for there is nothing more sacrosanct about them than about a board of aldermen. And, finally, must it be once more asserted that Catholic interest in education is so keen, that, out of their own meager funds, Catholics support schools, colleges, and universities, which this year are educating nearly three million young Americans?

Catholics, then, are not "opposed" to public education.

Catholics are not opposed to the public schools in the sense that they refuse to pay taxes to take care of bond issues, or to meet special school levies.

Catholics are not opposed to the public schools in the sense alleged by fellows of the baser sort. Catholics are not trying to destroy the system by corrupt schoolboards, political superintendents, or incompetent teachers; or its physical structures by acres of TNT sown in the basement at dead of night, when the watchman is taking his rest. That is stupid, silly stuff, good enough in a national campaign for the unpaved districts, but taken seriously by no man of sense.

But with all this premised, I have never been able to find any authority in the official pronouncements of the Church for the bald and open contention, "Catholics do not oppose the public schools." To take a practical example first, it seems to me that through a thousand and more educational institutions Catholics do oppose them in the most open, direct, and effective manner that could be devised. *Lex condendi, lex credendi*. If for every public school, opened at the expense of the public, we could build a Catholic school, we would do it. Providing liberally for every Catholic child, our ambition would be to find a place for every non-Catholic child, whose parents desired to take advantage of it.

While we acquiesce in the present system, we do so not because we think it fair, but because at present we can do nothing else. Schools founded on the theory that religion is not essential in education, will have an unhappy effect, we think, not only on Catholic children, but on all children. We consider such schools bad not only for God's Catholic children, but for all God's children, because the philosophy from which they spring is both un-American and un-Christian. For, as Pius XI reminded us, only eight months ago, no school can be really neutral. "Such a school cannot exist in practice," writes the Pontiff. "It is bound to become irreligious."

Now since the public schools, as we have them in this country persistently affirm that they are neutral schools, it follows that Catholics who think with Pius XI (who, after all, is a fair representative and leader of Catholic

thought) must oppose them. And the Pontiff immediately adds:

There is no need to repeat what Our Predecessors have declared on this point, especially Pius IX and Leo XIII, at times when laicism was beginning in a special manner to infect the public school. We renew and confirm their declarations, as well as the Sacred Canons in which the frequenting of non-Catholic schools, whether neutral or mixed, those namely, which are open to Catholics and non-Catholics alike, is forbidden for Catholic children, and can at most be tolerated, on the approval of the Ordinary alone, under determined circumstances of time and place, and with special precautions.

The citations given by the Pontiff show clearly the type of education that is condemned; or, if the term be preferred, is "opposed." It is precisely the type of which the American public school is the exponent.

The conclusion, then, is plain. "The school, if not a temple," quotes Pius XI, "is a den." The public school has never claimed to be a temple. Whatever its pretensions in this respect, it is, most assuredly, something which Catholics must oppose.

One or two corollaries of the formula call for comment.

Do Catholics found and support Catholic schools, simply because of a "preference" for them?

Is the fact that the State cannot teach religion sufficient justification for the maintenance at public expense of "neutral schools"?

The answer to the first question is that Catholics maintain Catholic schools not by reason of any "preference," but because of a positive obligation. The law of the Church, restating and illustrating the natural and the Divine laws, clearly imposes a *duty*.

As to the second, it is certainly true that the State is not commissioned to teach religion, since this is the exclusive office of Christ's Church. It does not follow, however, that the State is not bound to foster and to support religion by appropriate means. The State has just as much right to be irreligious or non-religious, as any individual has—that is, no right whatever. Now distributive justice requires, as Pius XI once more reminds us in his Encyclical of December 31, 1929, that Catholic education be aided from the public funds. The State cannot teach religion; be it so; but let it aid an agency which can, the Catholic school. The Pontiff did not rehearse this principle for our private edification, nor was he thinking exclusively of the country of Tartary Cham. He expects us to do what we can to make it an essential part of school administration, and in this country. It does not seem probable that we shall meet his wishes, expressed with Apostolic boldness, by the negative policy contained in the formula of no opposition to the public schools.

I permit myself to wonder why the Pontiff, following the mind of his predecessors, never teaches that we need not, or must not, oppose the public schools. It seems to be a formula unknown at Rome. If Catholics do not oppose them, what is the meaning of the Encyclical of 1929?

But if they do, the fact must be admitted, and the reason stated. Our attitude of opposition is by no means an isolated one. Hardly a day passes without the admission by some thoughtful non-Catholic that in a Christian

scheme of life the Catholic philosophy of education alone is valid.

We shall not help to bring others to that conclusion by taking refuge in conciliating phrases that minimize, when they do not deny. Such formulas are not olive branches. They are boomerangs.

Sociology

Home Ties

FLORENCE GILMORE

I ENGAGED Mrs. Antonelli because I was sorry for her. But I felt annoyed at my own soft-heartedness, even while we discussed our bargain. For three dollars and fifty cents a week she agreed to do my laundry work, sending for the basket every Monday morning, and returning it not later than Wednesday evening. From the first, I feared that both washing and ironing would be poorly done; and I knew that she would gladly have accepted three dollars, had I offered no more.

Worn out after a long siege of over-work, I had rented for the summer a small cottage, with a very small garden, on the smiling edge of a quaint, sleepy old town. The first time that I walked with father to the post office, I had seen Mrs. Antonelli's house, and had not forgotten it. No one could have passed the place without wondering how one yard could be so littered with everything under the sun, or one little house display such variety of cracked windows and sagging shades; or one family boast of so many and such dirty children—merry children they were, two or three of them romping with a puppy, and others shouting and laughing over a game, while their mother, smiling, watched them from the doorway.

It was only a day or two later that Mrs. Antonelli appeared at my door—a thin, worn, tender-faced woman, with her head enveloped in a rusty black shawl and her feet slipping about in slippers of a style long forgotten. She had learned that my house was occupied and had come to solicit work of any and every kind: washing, cleaning, gardening; she was eager to undertake them all, and boasted unblushingly of a versatility which would have put Leonardo the Florentine to shame. She explained, what I already knew, that she had a large family; and, as I could have surmised, "not so much money."

So, our bargain was made; and a sorry one for me it proved to be. The eldest of Mrs. Antonelli's boys came more or less promptly on Monday mornings to call for the laundry basket; but to get my things home again was another matter. Nearly every Saturday evening found me at Mrs. Antonelli's door, pleading for them, while she smilingly explained, in her most broken English, that it had rained on Tuesday; and had been cloudy and chilly on Wednesday; and on Thursday, when she was ready to begin my washing, either that little Rosa had fallen ill, or Tony had cut his foot on a bit of glass, or the baby had swallowed a few buttons. Every week I promised myself that I would not be annoyed with her even once more, but I never found courage to tell her so.

The slow summer wore on, and at last it was mid-

August. The first brown leaves began to drop lazily from my big elm, my flowers wearied of blooming, and I began to think hopefully of autumn, and home, and work again. If I remember rightly, it was on the afternoon of August twentieth that my daily walk chanced to lead me past Mrs. Antonelli's house; and I was amazed to see four or five of the younger children energetically cleaning the yard, and the elder ones washing windows. An hour later, repassing the house on my homeward way, I noted that much-mended but almost spotless curtains hung at three of the windows, and a vase of bright red, artificial roses adorned a window sill in what should have been the parlor.

After dusk that evening Mrs. Antonelli came to my door, more smiling than usual, but somewhat anxious and excited, too.

"I want to ask you, Miss," she explained disjointedly; "So very bad I want to ask you—because I need much money these days—if I can clean your house nice for you? Or, maybe there are some ugly weeds in your garden? No good at all for the flowers to have weeds any place near them. Maybe I could do something like that for you to make a little money. So very much I need some money. So many children I have—you have seen them yourself; and none of them with shoes; and Joe not one blouse fit to wear even if I mend it; and Tony no stockings at all, not even one."

I had intended to go into the village early the next morning in search of some one who would wash my windows. But I hesitated, knowing Mrs. Antonelli. Then, fortunately or unfortunately, I glanced again at her eager face, and stammered, still longing to keep my own interests at heart,

"My windows have not been cleaned lately, but—"

"So grimy they do look! So dirty!" Mrs. Antonelli interrupted, with such strong emphasis that I felt myself blushing. "And your flowers: how can you expect them to bloom nice all the time, when you let the weeds grow so thick all around them?"

I glanced guiltily at my flower beds. There were a few weeds in each of them; but not enough, I thought, to merit such contempt.

"But will you have time to do so much extra work?" I objected. "Even with only my washing to do, you have never been able to finish it before the end of the week." I was glad that, at last, it was my turn to take the offensive.

"I will have plenty of time. You will see. Plenty of time now. *Now*, I need the money very bad, so plenty of time," Mrs. Antonelli assured me.

I yielded, telling her to come the next morning to wash my windows; and promising, that if she did them promptly and at least fairly well, she would be permitted to weed my garden. "Possibly," I added, touched to see how her tired face had brightened; "possibly one of your boys could cut my grass."

Mrs. Antonelli beamed upon me. "So kind a lady you are! God bless you! Nickie, he cuts grass better than anyone you ever knew," she cried.

Bright and early the next morning, so very early that

I was still abed, Mrs. Antonelli came, accompanied by her highly recommended Nickie; and I must give them both credit for having worked swiftly and carefully that day. The following morning my flower beds were weeded; and when I paid Mrs. Antonelli for the two long hours which she and one of her little girls had spent upon them, she asked eagerly for yet more work.

"Maybe you need something cleaned in your cellar," she suggested; "Or up in your attic. Attics are awful places to get dusty. Even *my* attic, it is not always clean."

But I shook my head. My premises were clean enough by this time, and I was heartily tired of having her on my hands every morning.

"But so bad I need the money now," Mrs. Antonelli pleaded; and as I did not relent, she explained,

"You see, Miss, my husband, Tony—so good a husband he is to me! And his time will be up next Friday; and then, he will come home right away. Of course, he will come home as fast as he can. And I want everything to look nice in the house by that time, and the yard all neat, and the children all to have the nice clothes for him to see. Not for one minute do I want him to know how poor we have been all the while he was away. That would make him feel bad—and so kind man he is."

"But—" I began, with an objection on the tip of my tongue; and Mrs. Antonelli interrupted me.

"You know how it is when a person's husband is coming home. The children and me, we have not seen him but two times for three years, so far away that place is, and the bus so expensive. So, if you could need a little more work done before next Friday?"

She paused, and I tried to think of something else that she or one of her children could do for me.

"So smart a man my Tony is, and kind always to me and the children," Mrs. Antonelli reiterated.

But I hardly heard her, for as she spoke Mr. Anderson's big car glided past my gate. He owned an estate a mile farther down the road, and came to it occasionally for a week-end. His wife and daughter had been in Europe for a year or more. His only son was spending the summer in western Canada. No doubt, the servants were careful of his comfort. But Tony was the happier man. Mr. Anderson would never have a home-coming like his.

With Scrip and Staff

MRS. FARNHAM, whom I had not seen for many moons, was particularly pleased that so preoccupied a person as the Pilgrim (alliteration unpremeditated) appeared at her private exhibit of Byzantine ikons. My appetite for ikons is almost as weak as my appetite for cold bread pudding; but I was soon admiring these products of a forgotten artistry. The conventional, almost grim features of the sacred personages in these paintings was made up for by the skilled color processes, and by the delicate carvings and metal work that framed them.

It was when I asked about her daughter, Elise, that I realized how woefully I had failed to keep track of Farnham affairs. Years have passed since Elise's mother had

proudly boasted that with all her Catholic husband might do, he would never force on that poor child a "narrow" convent education. To Miss Wilkes' she should go; to Miss Wilkes' she would go; and to Miss Wilkes' she went. Casual meetings with Mrs. Farnham after that were always enlivened by stories of how supremely *happy* Elise was with Miss Wilkes. There was a sort of rosy haze of Miss Wilkes thrown around her. "Miss Wilkes means *so much* to all of us," her mother repeated. "She means everything to Elise; everything to us; everything to everyone who knows her." I never could find if she meant everything, or anything, to Papa: save his worried look when the topic of family budgets was touched upon.

Poor Mamma! She was now trying to forget, apparently, something I had never known. "Thank Heaven!" she exclaimed, "I have found a most lovely sanatorium. There Elise can pull herself together again. *Such* nursing! I believe that after six months I shall be able to get her to go back to her husband. Don't you think it would *really* be the best thing for her? You know how heavenly he has been towards her through it all. If she could only control herself just the least bit; just an ounce of self-discipline. And she is *so* gifted; so adorable. . . ."

TIME, however, that brought forgetfulness of Elise, has brought with it a considerable bit of knowledge of Miss Wilkes. I have never seen that estimable lady. I should like to, from a distance, in order to complete the picture. Gradually, from one mother or daughter after another, the picture has been filled in. It is always the same: Miss Wilkes "everything to us; everything to our daughter"; Miss Wilkes supremely able, charming, an educational magician; and utterly ruthless with any parents or children who fail to conform to her least regulation; Miss Wilkes successful, sought for, pleaded with; Miss Wilkes prescribing austere plain dress but Miss Wilkes expensive and select to the limit; Miss Wilkes demanding and obtaining with ease the most intimate confidences of every pupil; Miss Wilkes following her pupils up in later years, superintending their every move, determining their careers, planning for *their* children, making even their matches, and managing their own homes, by "intuition."

Yet what Miss Wilkes' own philosophy of life really is; what she in her heart of heart believes, no one seems to know. Certainly her pupils have no clear idea. The impression simply is: "Miss Wilkes: she is everything to us." "And if she is *not* everything to you," remarked one somewhat cynical pupil, "out you go!"

Or, as another one put it: "Miss Wilkes was simply the empress of your heart. She made you 'act religious' in chapel; because it was *the thing* to do. You would have died; you would have dropt through the floor, if you had done anything that wasn't the thing. And Miss Wilkes just drew you aside and told you, ever so gently, what *the thing* was."

LET me not belittle Miss Wilkes. To sustain such a reputation through years, and sustain it with ever

growing emphasis; to wield such power; to achieve such success in a field where numberless others, aiming at such ambitious heights, would miserably flop, shows true greatness. I should hymn praises to Miss Wilkes; were it not for Elise and that sanatorium; and were it not for some others not unlike Elise in their plight in later years. What was at fault?

Did you ever see a little book by Father Hull, S.J., entitled "Collapses in Adult Life?" Copies seem scarce now, and it ought to be reprinted. And the title is enough to scare anyone. But the heart of that question, which that title indicates, Father Hull places fairly and squarely in character education in early years. In treating that topic he stresses what educators sometimes overlook, that the teacher must appear before his class not as the exponent of himself (or herself), but as the servant of higher truths and standards of life to which he must pay reverence just as humbly as the least of his pupils. The educator for life, the educator who plants in his pupil's minds and hearts a lasting valuation of these things which will anchor him in later storms, is the one whose personality, instead of being magnified by his office, does humble reverence to laws, to truths, to an authority entirely outside of himself. Whatever genius he may have, whatever wit, charm or graces of temperament, all are but mere instruments to impress on the mind of youth that what he teaches is not his invention or his arbitrary will or convenience, but that his teaching is simply his homage to the compelling, objective truth.

Have we teachers of this latter stamp? We have; and the years that have brought me knowledge of Miss Wilkes have brought me examples of characters formed by such: not famed and "successful," as the world goes, but giving their pupils a lifelong legacy of wisdom. Such make no pretence of guiding their pupils in later life by any "intuition" or otherwise. They merely follow them with the prayer that they may remember and put in practice the principles they taught that they themselves once had learned; and what advice they later render is but an application of those principles.

NEITHER then, nor since, had I the heart to ask Mrs. Farnham just at what point in Elise's life did Miss Wilkes' far-famed intuition fail her. But some quiet day I will. And as I listened to Mrs. Farnham, I studied the ikons.

Rigid as they now seem, those ikons once were the storm center in a drama of life and death. One passionate emperor after another, such as Leo the Isaurian, proclaimed that it was not "the thing" for Christians and Catholics to venerate the holy images. The reason? The Emperor's will. Those who venerated the images—*not* for themselves, but for what they represented—were tortured and put to death. Veneration of the holy images became the test of *right thinking* amongst Catholics: *ortho-doxia*: "orthodoxy." The Faithful who braved the Emperor's edicts gloried in the title of orthodoxy, they were members of the Orthodox Church, which then knew no separation from Rome, the true fount of orthodoxy as well as of Christianity. So deep, however, was that dire

lesson imprinted on Christian memories, that even today, after twelve centuries or more, no act of religious worship is more characteristic of Christians of the Eastern rites—whether Catholics, or still separated by schism—than the veneration of the holy images. The Bolsheviks are well aware of the cruel wound they inflict on Christian hearts when they destroy or mock the sacred ikons, and substitute the image of Lenin in their place.

WE have no schismatic emperor to hinder modern American Catholics from venerating the fair image of the Mother of God, the Sacred Heart, or the Saints, in marble, bronze, or paintings. But there is a tyrant, the world, which is forever trying to enforce the edict that it is not "the thing" that these sacred images be carved in the soul of the Catholic child by Catholic education. The Catholic school in the twentieth century plays much the part that the ikon played in the seventh. The issue of Catholic education is not raised by us: it is raised by a world which has a deeper hatred of those sacred images than we care to acknowledge. It, too, is ready to deface or ridicule those images in the human heart; and to supplant them by a purely man-made ideal, so that it may be "everything" to us; and so God and our destiny be forgotten.

To defend those sacred spiritual images, by refusing to hearken to the world, by vindicating the Catholic school, may at times mean a struggle in some homes or communities almost as sharp as martyrdom. But the struggle once won will in due time be its own reward.

"Wonderful the honor that was paid to these pictures," murmured Mrs. Farnham as she leaned over a particularly exquisite bit of carved ivory. "Dear Miss Wilkes gave this to Elise on her wedding-day. I asked Elise last month if I might later send it on to her as a little memento of happy days; but Elise is so odd: she just turned her face away, and clenched her teeth." I turned my face away too, I must confess rather rudely; and pressed one of the crabbed old paintings to my lips. THE PILGRIM.

SPECULATION

I wonder why it always seems
That houses live at night
With little sounds and sudden gleams
Of unexpected light.
I never have decided why
A house sleeps all day through
Yet wakes at night to stretch and sigh
And do what houses do.

C. T. LANHAM

IF I HAD KNOWN

If I had known that meeting you once more
Could lay the ghost so suddenly
Of all my dreams of you—
If I had known that exorcism
Would come with your first word to me
After all these years of anguished longing and delay,
I should have crossed the world
To find you and the peace at last
Of freedom from my love for you.

SISTER MARIELLA.

Literature

The Critics of Humanism

CAMILLE MCCOLE

EVERY now and then, a sense of the futility of their daily endeavors falling suddenly upon them," said H. L. Mencken, in one of his not-infrequent moments of felicity, some twelve years ago, "the critics of Christendom turn to a somewhat sour and depressing consideration of the nature and objects of their own craft. That is to say, they turn to criticizing criticism!" And although Mr. Canby confidently assured us of the demise of the Humanistic controversy by writing a *post-mortem* upon it, it was inevitable that the Humanist symposium "Humanism and America" should in its turn be criticized. We have this criticism in C. Hartley Grattan's recent book "The Critique of Humanism." And what a "depressing consideration" of Humanism Mr. Grattan and the other contributors of this volume have given us! How seriously and feverishly they have taken this business of criticizing criticism!

It is, indeed, a little difficult at first to assign a reason for the frenetic efforts of these young critics (most of them under thirty-five years of age) who are so deadly opposed to Humanism. Does not Mr. Winters assure us in "The Critique of Humanism" itself that the Humanists are not likely to "exert any profound influence on the future of American letters"? And does not Mr. Rascoe in the book refer to this "Humanism business" as "one of those terrific tempests in a teapot," as if it were not to be taken at all seriously? And does not Mr. Cowley speak with the same disdain of American Humanism when he tells us that it is "a movement that may be compared in scope with Ethical Culture, or at the most with Christian Science"? Does not Mr. Wilson show us that Professor Babbitt even mistranslates his Greek, that he is still so old-fashioned as to follow "the Victorian tradition of Jebb and Jowett" in at least one particular error?

And does not everyone know that Paul Elmer More once used the words "camouflage" and "intrigue" when the latter "used as a verb has now become the sole property of Theodore Dreiser who has earned the right to be slovenly in his diction" and the former "has not been used by anyone with a sense of style since the word was done to death during the war"? (Mr. Rascoe here forgets apparently how contemptuous Mr. Wilson thought it was, several pages previously, of More to "correct Whitehead's grammar.") And finally isn't it clearly manifest that even the style of the Humanists is, for the most part negligible, that it is nothing more than "colorless prose or prose that is conspicuous for its muddled metaphors, harsh rhythms, awkward vocabulary and lack of original ideas"? Why then all the alarm that is evidenced in "The Critique of Humanism" over this "Humanism business," and over what "these angry professors," this "small clique of the self-anointed," called Humanists, are doing?

For in their attempts to laugh it out of court the opponents of Humanism show clearly enough how genuine

their alarm really is. And with good reason, too, because now for the first time perhaps since the beginning of this century American literature has found in the Humanists a group of men—scholars, critics, and men with fairly high ethical standards—who are organized sufficiently to make an articulate and effective protest against those pernicious “forces” which have prevailed in our literature and made “their boast in blackness” during the long night of the past three decades. They are men, these Humanists, who are unwilling to admit that Sherwood Anderson is “the American author considered to be most promising”; men who do not agree (with Dreiser’s own publishers) that Theodore Dreiser is “the rock on which the future of American letters must be raised”; men who dare to raise dissenting voices in a critical world that has so successfully established the forces of naturalism, “realism,” and Freudism as traditions in our letters.

The reader of “The Critique of Humanism” will notice, first of all, the disparity in the various papers that have been contributed to it—papers that range all the way from the somewhat fatuous and sneering essay of Mr. Rascoe and the egregious abstractions of Mr. Grattan himself, to two or three of the essays which claim to accept many of the more positive tenets of Humanism but over-emphasize its limitations. But if the book has any one unifying factor it is that one and all of the contributors object very clamorously but not very cogently to Humanism as a way out of our literary chaos and try to make us believe that Humanism is some dread Juggernaut that is going to destroy us in its wake. What are a few of their objections to Humanism?

For one thing, they object, these opponents of More and Babbitt and their followers, to the Humanist’s evident ignorance of contemporary letters and to their “high-handed habit of disposing jeeringly of contemporary writers whom they plainly haven’t read.” In some very small measure, these objections may be justifiable, but we wonder if Mr. Grattan and his colleagues do not exaggerate the picture for us? They would make of Paul Elmer More, Professor Babbitt, and their associates, a group of very solemn and tearless pall bearers carrying what they consider to be the corpse of contemporary literature to a grave from which it is never to be exhumed without the permission of Humanism itself. They depict these men as blissfully ignorant of the literature of their own day—as “angry professors” who have been immured within the walls of their colleges so long that they are now only “impotent” and “feeble” guides to literature. But we may wonder whether—to take but one example—Mr. More in his scholarly “Shelburne Essays” has not given our day more that is truly salutary, more that is for our own good, than all these younger men who now choose to shout so loudly at the doctor.

Mr. Chamberlain, for example, is very distressed that the Humanists are so “cranky because the millennium is not upon our necks” and he says that as we are, “many of us, shufflers . . . the only sort of literature that can issue from us is of the sort that will continue to annoy” such “cranky” critics. But is this not evasion of the most faint-hearted sort? Because we are “shufflers”

now, must we always be such and must we scoff at and call the Humanists “cranky” merely because they find much that is false in our day and because they are intrepid and capable enough to take up their arms and, by opposing, end what is so false?

For another thing, the opponents of Humanism object to the Humanists’ adherence to that “dull authority of the past.” They maintain, as Mr. Wilson puts it, that there “can be no advances in philosophy without the altering of old conceptions” and they find fault with Humanistic values because they are derived (to quote Mr. Grattan this time) “particularly from formulations arrived at in a primitive society where the authors could not conceivably imagine many of the most vital and complex problems of modern living.” Or again, they suggest, in the words of Mr. Blackmur, that the Humanistic “principles do not fit the subject matter, because they were gained *a priori*,” or they maintain (at least Mr. Grattan does) that if values are to be useful they “cannot be prohibitions against certain ways of living.” This last certainly no Scholastic can accept and it is, for that matter, difficult to see how any Christian can. Even our Ten Commandments are “prohibitions against certain ways of living” and rather good values, too!

What the opponents of Humanism seem to forget is that there are certain “old conceptions,” certain standards, certain truths, which are permanent and eternal and if it be true that the Humanists have gained these *a priori*, if this is what Mr. Blackmur means, then we must suggest that Dr. More and his associates come to us far better prepared as critics than their opponents who, because they are so devoid of “old conceptions” are only adding to the confusion of literary standards today. That “dull authority of the past” should still be able to teach us something and now, more than ever before, we need it. We know, as well as Mr. Grattan and his fellow-contributors, that Eugene O’Neill is not Sophocles and that they belong to two entirely different ages. But Sophocles can show us much that is wrong with O’Neill.

Again the Scholastic philosophy predicates man as having a free will. Much that is soundest in Humanism is likewise based upon this predication. The Humanists insist, with Paul Elmer More, that we “are endowed with the potentiality of free will and answerable for our choice of good or evil.” This Humanist will Mr. Grattan dismisses as a “figment of the imagination, without validity to anyone with an elementary knowledge of modern scientific thought on the subject.” Science will not approve, Mr. Grattan assures us, of values which contradict the “natural constitution of man” and he adds that allegiance to such values will never be “predicated upon any metaphysical free will nor upon any recognition of the unprovable allegation that there is one law for nature and another for man.”

This point alone must, for the Scholastic, invalidate the position of the anti-Humanists. This matter alone should make us overlook the exaggerated “usual intellectual arrogance” of Paul Elmer More and the alleged “snobbery” of Professor Babbitt’s doctrine, and the allegation that the Humanist is blind to what is actually “beneath

his nose." This alone should make us suspect the Humanists' opponents, or at least the majority of them. For if we are not to predicate, at the outset, the doctrine of man's free will, we cannot accept that of man's moral responsibility. And if we cannot accept this, no amount of sympathy with our age, no amount of seeing what is beneath one's nose, can justify us in exacting an ethical content in our literature. We must therefore stand with Humanism on this point.

Nor can the Scholastic look with favor upon those of the anti-Humanists who would discredit the assumption that man is by his moral sense and by his refinements and sensibilities exalted above the rest of the animal kingdom. When Mr. Hazlitt, for example, suggests that the "phenomenon of house-training, common to nearly all adult dogs, is in itself sufficient to discredit Mr. Babbitt's belief that only man can control his immediate desires," the remark sounds no more facetious than does the observation of Mr. Chamberlain that, literally speaking "the answer to the Humanist demand for the typically human is—the complete works of Ring Lardner."

But when Mr. Hazlitt maintains that it has, as yet, by no means been established that man is morally superior to the animal—then we will have to take him seriously. When he further suggests that not every difference between ourselves and the rest of the animal kingdom is "necessarily in our favor," we must protest.

The Scholastic cannot accept by far the greater part of what Mr. Grattan and his colleagues have to offer us in "The Critique of Humanism." He will see how untenable is the position of those who oppose Humanism and he will perhaps, in wondering at the grasp which such men seem to have on our letters, be inclined to account for it by taking a quotation from one of these opponents of Humanism and apply it to those opponents themselves: "No wonder they are so strong in polemics; for they derive their chief significance from the presence of their enemies." One more quotation. Mr. Grattan himself is kind enough to observe that "Humanism is merely a point of rest on the threshold of the church." Let us keep the door as wide open as possible.

REVIEWS

The Mystery of Faith and Human Opinion. By MAURICE DE LA TAILLE, S.J. Collected and in part translated by J. B. Schimpf, S.J. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. \$5.00.

The brilliant scholar of the Holy Eucharist, Father de la Taille, needs no introduction to the world of theological students. His "Mysterium Fidei" may be said to have been the focusing point of all Eucharistic writing of the more learned kind in recent years. Defenders and attackers of Father de la Taille's doctrine have laid on lustily, and, of course, the author himself has not stood away from the fray. And what an antagonist he is! Masterful, yet ever gentlemanly, with a courtesy that is never ruffled—a splendid example of this was his recent article, "A propos d'un livre sur la Cène" in *Gregorianum* (April-June, 1930, Vol. XI, fasc. 2, pp. 194-263)—Father de la Taille has us inwardly applauding his sportsmanship even while we are following his every blow. But there is something more noble than sportsmanship in him. All through his writings he makes the reader feel that he has followed his own advice (p. 278): "It [theology] requires above all things serenity of mind, peace, that peace for which a genius like St.

Thomas is preeminently admirable. . . . To that let us aspire, rather than to the name of scholars or to the name of critics . . . and let those who can, prove by the meekness of their spirit that they have understood best the Mystery of our Faith." The present book, which we owe to the Jesuit rector of St. Joseph's Church, Mobile, is a sheaf of essays collected from various sources. Over half the book is a translation from French and Latin, the remaining essays having been written in English by the author himself. Though the book will make its greatest appeal to priests, it deserves reading, nay, rather close study, by all who are interested in Catholic doctrine and practice as centered about the Holy Eucharist.

F. P. LEB.

The Religious Background of American Culture. By THOMAS CUMING HALL, D.D. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. \$3.00.

Dr. Hall presents in this volume a most interesting if somewhat revolutionary theory in regard to our culture. He declares that the schoolbooks are wrong in teaching that Calvinistic Puritanism is the basis of our national and religious notions. To his way of thinking, our religious background is radicated in that form of English Dissent sired by Wyclif and the Lollards. The latter had no churches, no sacraments, and no priesthood; for they taught that the elect were sufficiently illuminated by the Holy Spirit. In these respects they differed from the Calvinists, but their teachings closely resemble phenomena which have never been lacking in American religious sects—the lay governing element in religious bodies, meeting houses rather than churches, revivals, "blue laws," and a hatred of amusements. In considering the genesis of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, Dr. Hall also sees traces of the Dissenting tradition. He asserts that the religious tolerance displayed in these documents, supposedly derived from Puritanism, was due to naught but the religious indifferentism which Dissent sooner or later engenders. There are certain misunderstandings of Catholic doctrines, as, for instance, when the author fails to see any appreciable difference between the teachings of Calvin and of St. Augustine on predestination, and when he insists upon speaking of the "magic" of the Sacraments. The chapter on the Catholic Church in America is in many respects thought-provoking and carefully written. Although the connection between Lollardism and English Dissent might be more thoroughly developed, the book is nevertheless well worth studying, especially by those interested in American religious history. As Dr. Hall says, no book has yet made any real attempt in this direction.

W. C. S.

Political Theory and Law in Medieval Spain. By MARIE R. MADDEN, Ph.D., with a Foreword by MOORHOUSE I. X. MILLAR, S.J. New York: Fordham University Press. \$4.00.

The failure of much modern government has stimulated fresh interest among lawyers in the study of fundamental legal concepts. To mention only one, Dean Roscoe Pond tried to reexamine the framework of law with a view to basing it on something more solid than human reason, mere caprice or the feeble force of customary behavior. His conclusions were admittedly unsatisfactory, even to himself. He could not strike bed-rock. The same problem is handled by Dr. Madden by the sound method of analogy and contrast. Medieval Spain is the specimen she puts under the microscope, discovering there the inspirational origins of law and government, vested with a rich social character, guided by a true image of authority and concerned with an adequate concept of justice. Her work is divided into two parts: the first expounding principles and the second dealing with the administrative machinery devised for their correct operation. In the former are traced in detail the doctrines of St. Isidore of Seville, the *Lex Visigothorum* and *Las Siete Partidas*; in the latter, the Kingship, the Councils of the King, the Municipalities and the Cortes are described. In her introductory chapter, Professor Madden does not overlook Spanish indebtedness to Aristotle, St. Augustine, and the Catholic Faith. She admits Peninsular political thought never quite separated from philosophy and theology, and then points out that when the distinction was attempted decadence resulted: "Justice torn

from its Divine source becomes nothing more than a function of the will, guided by reason, it is true, but reason interpreted in the purely empirical sense of a synthesis of social experience. Tradition becomes but crystallized inertia. The institutions of the modern state are reflecting this influence." Justice is the plan by which God governs His universe; this is an epitome of Spanish legal theory from the age of the *Forum Judiciorum*, the first code after the Council of Toledo, up to the publication of the celebrated "Code of the Indies." But in *Las Siete Partidas* the influence of the Roman Justinian Law could not be mistaken. A shadow fell on the Augustinian City of God. The strict Graeco-Roman ideal, "To each one his due" congealed the warm blood in the Iberian union of hearts, interests and wills obedient to the Will Divine. Rights, in their source and sanction, were sought within the individual. Law was looked upon as right reason, and, at bottom, nothing but a function of the will. While the Augustinian phraseology lingered on, the interpretation was Stoic. No wonder the will of the prince came to have the force of law and that in these later days the will of the State is conceived of as sovereign and omnipotent. This blight of Roman Law on Spanish political institutions is, according to Miss Madden, the explanation of Spain's imperfect success in governing her colonies in the New World. As a remedy for the evils of present-day government, she advocates a return to the philosophy of St. Augustine, "insofar as it has been supplemented by St. Thomas and the later day Scholastics." Ways and means to effect this were beyond the scope of the essay. The only serious mistake is a reference to the popular election of bishops: "As both clergy and people elected bishops, the government of the Church had a democratic significance, which made the bishops the most genuine representatives of the necessities and aspirations of the people." Is this not to confuse the right of presentation with the right of effective election? Then, too, there is a tendency to consider laws as equivalent to rights and words as tantamount to deeds. The Foreword by Father Millar contains a powerful plea for human liberty based on a proper concept of sovereignty and the forces which should motivate law. The whole book, with its happy selection of type, paper, illustrations and binding is a credit to the Fordham University Press. But what is more important, the contents continue the University's high distinction for preeminence in the field of political philosophy.

J. F. T.

La Parole de Dieu. Par E. JACQUIER, O.P. Paris: Bernard Grasset.

"The Word of God" is a phrase which has many degrees of significance and many prolongations of its meaning: in this respect it is like that other timeless phrase, "the Kingdom of God." Père Jacquier, O.P., who is probably the foremost Catholic authority upon the ensemble of New Testament documentary questions, has attached himself to the *written* Word and has made a masterly exposition of it in this ninth volume in the important series "La Vie Chrétienne" which is being published by Bernard Grasset, of Paris. There are two clear divisions to the book: the canon and the text of the New Testament—the determination of the documents wherein the Word is to be found, and the establishment of the readings they contain. One may be moved to note that most theologians permit themselves an intolerable self-deception when they appeal directly to the written Word without ever having acquired a philological technique, and when to protect their technical weakness they retreat upon a non-existent "consensus of all specialists." One would not wish all Catholic theologians to be Scriptural philologists, for they have the Word in a *living* magisterium; but if they choose with Père Jacquier methodically to stand on codices, they cannot honestly dispense themselves from his hard discipline. He makes a splendid review of modern critical systematizations: of Westcott-Hort, Burgon, Miller, Weiss, Kenyon, Hoskier, Von Soden, etc.; but he is forced in the end to say that upon the whole textual problem of the New Testament critical opinion is more at variance than ever. Now this admission is in no wise disturbing to a Catholic theologian, who knows the Word of God as a living thing, first and last, original and present;

who knows that from the living Word the written Word has proceeded, and that by the living Word the written Word is reaffirmed and interpreted to living men. The more philology a Catholic theologian knows, the less he values it and the more freely he uses it as a routine procedure. But the textual difficulties which are merely his summer annoyances of detail, become fire and earthquake in the religion of rigid philology. For in philology, the tree of life is the *stemma codicum*, the branching of the manuscripts; and whether Westcott-Hort, working in from all the twigs, find four torn limbs hanging in the trunkless air, or whether present philological opinion knows only three, they are all religiously barren and dead, or at best dare only hope for a critical reintegration eons away in the future. The neutral text of Westcott-Hort is an outworn hypothesis now, the Antiochene text is in favor, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are not so venerable as heretofore. The Vaticanus, which is "out" as a neutral text is "in" for its Alexandrian characteristics. And the "occidental text" appears to be merely a convenient name for heterogeneity. Meanwhile the religionists must go treeless and hungry. This is the situation which has brought on the revolt of the Marburg theologians, and has given Karl Barth strength to match issues with Harnack. This is the realization which has given Lutheranism a new exegesis in which philological reason no longer rules nor judges, but stands subject and defendant before the imperious splendor of the Divine Fact among us. This is a situation which Père Jacquier does not envisage in these clear technical chapters, but which nevertheless prompts an earnest wish that our Catholic theology may definitively put the living Word at the basis of Catholic method. In this connection, one somewhat regrets that Père Jacquier did not allow himself to consider the recent discussions on the oral style of the New Testament, nor to discuss Dom Quentin's method of establishing a *stemma codicum* for a "living text" like the Vulgate.

F. B.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Studies in History.—"Ancient Corinth, Part I, From the Earliest times to 404 B.C." (Johns Hopkins Press. \$5.00) is a scholarly monograph by J. G. O'Neill, professor of Classics at Maynooth College, Ireland. As the learned author points out in his preface, Corinth occupied a place in the history of Greece second only to that of Athens and Sparta. Its inhabitants possessed "a clearly defined national character" which makes their contribution to civilization more important than is usually recognized. Beginning with a chapter on the topography of Corinth, Dr. O'Neill proceeds to a description of the city and its citadel. He then successively treats prehistoric Corinth, early accounts, cults and myths; the tyranny and the constitution which followed it; Corinth's early colonial system; and finally the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars. Not content with a profound knowledge of the best literature on his subject, before preparing his book Dr. O'Neill made a thorough exploration of the Corinthia in conjunction with members of the American School of Athens. In addition to several splendid views, the work contains a detailed drawing showing the main excavation area of the city, 1896-1927.

Under the title "The Reformation, Catholicism and Freedom" (Macmillan. \$2.40.) J. W. Poynter has written a curious book to demonstrate that the Catholic Church would do better not to hold so persistently to its claim of being the unique Christian guardian of Christ's mission. The volume, which deals with the various persecutions and disabilities of Catholics in England, is largely a compilation from recognized authorities ranging from special studies to such standard works as "Britannica" and the "Catholic Encyclopedia." It goes without saying that, in spite of this, the author, an apostate Catholic, has utterly failed to prove his point. One is surprised to see Dr. Headlam, the Anglican bishop of Gloucester, who writes the preface, intimating that the Catholic Church has ever been the enemy of freedom of thought. The book is published in London by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

There has just appeared a new and revised edition of "What Civilization Owes to Italy" (Stratford. \$3.00.) by Dr. James

J. Walsh. Coming at a time when Italy has concluded a concordat with the Holy See which places it in the front rank of Catholic countries, this new edition of one of Dr. Walsh's most popular books is very timely. It will be remembered that the purpose of the original work was to show how much Western civilization owes to the Italians not only in the higher fields of painting, sculpture, architecture and music, but also in the more practical branches of education, science, law, and geographical discovery and exploration. In a new preface the author expresses the hope that as the great glories of Italy, in the past, were achieved because the country was steeped in Catholic culture, so the future holds forth the possibility of a renaissance entirely Christian. If such an event took place, our present age would be still further indebted to Italy for many centuries to come. But whatever one wishes to hold on this subject, one cannot deny Italy's past greatness was to a large extent owing to its intense religious spirit.

The "Catholic Mind."—In the issue of the *Catholic Mind* for September 22 (America Press, 5 cents), Dom J. Hebert Desroquettes, O.S.B., removes all possibility of misconceiving the mind of the Church on sacred music by his lucid explanation and defense of the *Motu Proprio* of Pius X, and the Apostolic Constitution issued last year by the present Holy Father. He calls his article "The Church's Own Reasons for Plain-song." This same issue contains the sermon of John J. Wynne, S.J., delivered at the Solemn Pontifical Mass at the Martyrs' Shrine, Auriesville, N. Y., on August 17, 1930. For the coming month of October there is a brief closing selection on the Holy Rosary.

French Apologetics.—Abbé Klein continues in his collection "Des Fleurs et des Fruits" (Editions Spes, Paris) to direct young France in the way of the strenuous life. Four more volumes are at hand. There is a translation of Sir William Butler's "Red Cloud," done by M. Serre; and another of the adventures of Mr. Pickwick, done by Marion Gilbert and illustrated (with less than English rotundity) by Jean Priet. A third number is "Le Soldat de Cortez," by Th. Cudlipp, with a preface by Louis Bertrand. And the last is "Jeux et divertissements," a manual of white magic and entertainment.

G. Joannès has written an Augustinian lyric under the somewhat diffuse title "Les Audiences divines et la voix de Dieu dans les êtres et dans les choses" (Téqui, Paris). There is no question here of the *gratiae gratis datae*, but of the Voice of the Shepherd—heard with the attention of Chateaubriand. In the noises and silence of the solitude: a voice in the horizons, in the sea and in the setting sun; a voice in the eternal city, out of the Vatican and along the Aventine; a voice in the seasons, of Noël, of agony, of resurrection. The authoress has further ventured to turn the old allegory of spiritual ascent into the more powered allegory of our age of burnished wings. G. Joannès, with French aptness, has been named a *théologienne*, and one is not inclined to question the name: remembering that if she is constrained to remain the pupil of such genuine masters as Gratre and Gardeil, it is no little theology to have repeated their lessons.

The first volume of Abbé Quinet's "Carnet de préparation d'un catéchiste: (Editions Spes, Paris), has already received whole-hearted praise; no less is due to the second volume on grace and the Sacraments. It is not too much to say, even in the face of recent American efforts, that no other catechetical method of our acquaintance has depth comparable to this. The dramatic power of Abbé Quinet's blackboard technique, the reconstructive activity he demands of pupils, the clear substantialities of his chosen topics and his open roads of "personal religion," must be recognized.

Abbé Maire's "Histoire des instituts religieux et missionnaires" (Lethielleux, Paris) is a directory one would ill part with: a synthetic and documented survey of Religious Orders and congregations now active in the Church. It is intended as a manual for pastors, teachers and the public at large. It is likewise intended for the missionary bodies themselves, "that everybody may know everybody else better."

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

"Words Addressed to My Next Nurse"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I consider James Fitzgerald's article, "Words Addressed to My Next Nurse," extremely rude and unfair. The author implies that our nurses are too machine-like, that their work lacks a certain personal quality. He does not give us a very clear picture of the treatment he got from his first nurse, but he goes on to dilate at length on the treatment that he expects from his next nurse.

I may as well finish this in the first person. I can certainly speak with much more authority than can the author of the article mentioned above. He admits that he had a nurse for two hours; I have had them for hundreds of hours, and I have spent many additional hours with patients who were in their care. The only memories I have of nurses are pleasant ones. My only thoughts of them are thoughts of admiration. I am strongly convinced that theirs is a very hard, and frequently a very heroic life.

The nurses I have had have practically all been kind and motherly, just as they should be. They were young ladies who could anticipate the wants of the sick; and they generally did. They might speak of a patient as "the appendectomy in Room 13," but they did not treat the patient in such an impersonal manner. I think it perfectly natural that they should speak of patients in that manner; although I confess that I have just as often, if not oftener, heard them speak of their patients as "the dear old lady in Room 13," etc. I have found them very delicate lest they give pain, tactful in regard to speech, quiet and efficient in their round of duties. Moreover, those whom I have met have always showed a certain refinement and delicacy in dealing with the many little touchy and distasteful functions they are forced to perform, such as the bath Mr. Fitzgerald dreaded to receive.

Taking things as a whole, nurses deserve to have someone accord them a little praise instead of crying out in a discordant voice for the "very paragon of a nurse."

I don't know whether or not Mr. Fitzgerald will ever have occasion to need another nurse, but if he does, and if he again receives impersonal and machine-like treatment, I recommend that he examine himself and see if his own conduct does not provoke the nurse to give him just that—and nothing more.

St. Louis.

G. K.

Bellarmino and Mariana

To the Editor of AMERICA:

When I was a student nearly forty years ago, I read Bellarmine's arguments on the subject of government, and at the same time came across excerpts from the work of another scholastic, Mariana by name. For many years I have never been able to get my hands on a copy of Bellarmine's works. At the time I read them, they were in Latin, and as far as I know, they have never been published.

I think for the good of our people and for the purpose of breaking down prejudice that the works of Bellarmine pertaining to this particular subject especially, and the works of Mariana, should be translated and distributed throughout the United States.

Wallace, Ida.

J. H. W.

[The Fordham University Press, Woolworth Bldg., New York City, publishes "De Laicis—A Treatise on Government" by Bellarmine, translated by K. E. Murphy, Ph.D. \$1.25; "Political Economy of Juan de Mariana" by John Laures, S.J., Ph.D. \$3.00—this is not a translation of Mariana, but a dissertation on his political economy. Copious extracts from the works of St. Robert Bellarmine are to be found in "The State and the Church" by Ryan and Millar, S.J., (Macmillan) and in the article "Bellarmino and the Constitution" by Father Millar, S.J., in *Studies* for September, 1930.—Ed. AMERICA.]